The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXII, No. 2 February, 1945

CONTENTS

Reinhold Niebuhr and the Catholic Church. Part III: Catholic Moral Teaching . *Edmond Darvil Benard* 81

Rectory on Wheels . . . *Walter P. Burke, C.S.P.* 95

Should Priests Pray the Mass? . *Gerald Ellard, S.J.* 103

The Church of the Apostles and the Secular Authority *Nigel Larn* 110

Recent Dogmatic Theology . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 119

Apologetics and Preaching . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 130

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Morality of Universal Conscription 139

The Eucharistic Fast 140

Artificial Insemination 140

Should Folded Chasubles Have Been Worn On Christmas Eve? 141

Washing the Sacred Linens 142

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1945, by The American Ecclesiastical Review

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Carrying the Chalice Veil to the Gospel Side . . . 142
Washing the Hands After Mass 143
Must the Ostensorium Be Blessed? 144

ANALECTA 145

BOOK REVIEWS

Catholic Art and Culture, *by Edward Ingram Watkin* . . 151
The Church and the Papacy, *by Trevor Gervase Jalland* . . 152
Origen, His Life at Alexandria, *by René Cadiou* . . . 154
The Calling of a Diocesan Priest, *by Joseph Clifford Fenton* . 156

BOOK NOTES 159

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We Solicit Your Co-operation

Notice of change of address should be sent to us promptly, and at the same time the old address should be given.

Sometimes a subscriber overlooks reporting change of address; and now and then a subscriber dies, and in either case his copy continues to be sent to his former address. In such cases notification from Successor or Pastor would be appreciated.

You May Use the Blank Below:

NAME: .....

OLD ADDRESS: .....

NEW ADDRESS: .....

OTHER INFORMATION: .....

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
PART III: CATHOLIC MORAL TEACHING

In the November, 1944, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, we outlined the theoretical bases of Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr's idea of Christianity. In December we examined at some length his attack upon the "intolerance" of the Catholic Church. It is the purpose of this article to consider his criticism of Catholic moral teachings.

The principal fault that Professor Niebuhr finds in Catholic ethics is the importance given to the element of "natural law." Dr. Niebuhr's ideas on Christianity and on morality in general are marked by a sharp anti-rational bias, so it is not surprising to find that, for him: "Undue confidence in human reason, as the seat and source of natural law, makes this very concept of law into a vehicle of human sin. It gives the peculiar conditions and unique circumstances in which reason operates in a particular historical moment, the sanctity of universality."[1] The difficulty with the "impressive structure of Catholic ethics" is that "it constantly insinuates religious absolutes into highly contingent and historical moral judgments."[2] This "confusion" has serious consequences; it "accounts for the fury and self-righteousness into which Catholicism is betrayed when it defends feudal types of civilization in contemporary history as in Spain for instance."[3]

(To those who read our December article, that last quotation from Dr. Niebuhr's *The Nature and Destiny of Man* should have a familiar ring. The "fury" of Catholicism is back again doing business at the old stand.)

So that it will be clear just what we are talking about, let us see, first of all, what the "natural law" is. There is nothing mysterious about it, nor is it difficult to understand. Man is a rational animal. Because of his nature, because of the very fact that he is what he is, he has certain tendencies and inclinations. Not only does he possess natural inclinations, he is also endowed

[1] Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), I, 281.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 221.

with reason, by means of which he, unlike all other animals, can recognize these inclinations, and realize that they are natural to him—that he has them precisely because he is the sort of being he is, and that they tend towards his own "good," or perfection. Therefore, on the strength of them, he can formulate certain rules or norms by which his free conduct must be guided if he is to act truly as a man. The inclinations are natural, the recognition of them is natural: therefore the resulting code of action is correctly called "the natural law." It is a participation, proper to man's rational nature, of the Eternal Law.

Perhaps the matter will be made a bit clearer by mentioning some of the inclinations on which the natural law is based. Certain of these man shares with all creatures, such as the inclination for self-preservation. Others he possesses because of his animal nature, such as the inclination to generate children and furnish them with an adequate preparation for meeting the duties and dangers of life. Still other inclinations are present in man because he is a *rational* animal; for instance, man is inclined to live in society with his fellows. All these inclinations, may we repeat, are in man because of what he is. It should be noted also that the thing which differentiates man from the other animals, and which makes him specifically a man, is his reason. A man, therefore, cannot excuse an action by pointing to a parallel mode of acting in brute creation and thus claiming that it is "natural." It is not natural for *man* unless it is in accord with *reason*, which is the distinguishing element in *his* nature.

The foregoing, obviously, is an extreme simplification of the concept of the natural law, but we think it is sufficient for an introduction to Dr. Niebuhr's criticisms. We shall mention some other aspects of the notion of natural law in our specific answers to Dr. Niebuhr's objections.

Professor Niebuhr's main criticism of the Catholic teaching on natural law is, as may be seen from the quotations with which we opened this article, the role played by human reason. His position seems to be that reason can not be relied upon to furnish us the judgments which are to act as norms for our free action, and which constitute the natural law in the strict and proper sense.

As nearly as we can determine, Dr. Niebuhr's anti-rational position is based upon a triple foundation. One element we might term pseudo-philosophical, another semi-theological, and the

third, quasi-Scriptural. We have used these terms not with any desire for "smart" language, but simply because they seem to us an adequate description of Dr. Niebuhr's argument.

The first basis for Dr. Niebuhr's criticism of the natural law is undoubtedly his aprioristic assumption that human reason is incapable of recognizing and formulating a rule of action which would be universally true, that is, reliable as a guide in all circumstances and for all times. This depreciation of reason, we must note, is an epistemological postulate. It is not proved, and cannot be proved. It is not a new position; there is a curious similarity, for instance between the arguments of Reinhold Niebuhr in the twentieth century and those of William of Ockham in the fourteenth.[4] But we believed that it is more accurately described as "pseudo-philosophical" than as "philosophical," because it is the negation and destruction of philosophy rather than a contribution to it.

While everyone will admit that human reason can and does make mistakes—notably, as we shall see, in conclusions remote from first principles—still, to impugn the rational nature of man as the basis of any moral system is to poison the wells of morality and of thought. "Deprive man of reason, and what is left is not man, but animal. This looks like a very commonplace statement, yet Western culture is dying wherever it has been forgotten; for the rational nature of man is the only conceivable foundation for a rational system of ethics."[5]

If Dr. Niebuhr mistrusts the power of reason, we cannot for a moment imagine why he bothered to write *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, and to marshal arguments in favor of his opinions. But of course, even for an anti-rational author, it is as difficult to avoid an appeal to reason as it was for the unfortunate Mr. Dick to keep from mentioning King Charles's head.

The retort might be made that Dr. Niebuhr does not deny the power of reason to arrive at some semblance of truth, however pitifully inaccurate and infrequently attained; but that he simply denies the power of reason to arrive at universal norms of conduct on the basis of human nature. However, if man is unable to re-

[4] Readers interested in William of Ockham's position will find it summarized in Etienne Gilson's *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), pp. 62-91.

[5] Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*, p. 274.

cognize inclinations in his own nature—a recognition springing from his own internal experience and from simple observation of his fellows; if he is unable to recognize these inclinations as bound up inextricably with his nature as a man, and to formulate certain broad general rules of conduct on the strength of them: then, we may ask, what *can* reason do? Why is man endowed with reason, if he cannot be guided by it? Dr. Niebuhr, on the question of natural law, does not attack primarily the power of reason to arrive at a conclusion which is the result of a long, complicated ratiocination. Peculiarly, he attacks reason precisely at the point where it is *least* vulnerable. He attacks its power to formulate basic, fundamental principles, such as "Do good, and avoid evil," *which are immediately evident to all men.*

It would be futile to continue the philosophical discussion further; we cannot repeat the course in epistemology dealing with the validity of the sense and intellectual knowledge of men. What we do desire to make clear is that Dr. Niebuhr's anti-rational position is the result of a postulate, or presupposition, which is not and cannot be proved, and which the common sense of men must repudiate as absurd, regardless of the mystical quality of the language in which it is expressed.

We have said that Dr. Niebuhr's second basis may be called semi-theological. It is best summarized in his own words:

> Protestantism significantly places the rational concept of the "natural law" in a more insignificant position than in Catholic thought. It has too strong a sense of the individual occasion, and the uniqueness of the individual who faces the occasion, to trust in general rules. The will of God is the norm, the life of Christ is the revelation of that will, and the individual faces the awful responsibility of seeking to do God's will amidst all the complexities of human existence with no other authoritative norm but that ultimate one.[6]

> The human spirit in its freedom is finally bound only by the will of God. . . .[7]

Dr. Niebuhr, then, distrusts the natural law presumably because we cannot be sure that it represents the will of God. And anyone will agree with Dr. Niebuhr that if God arbitrarily insti-

[6] Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, I, 60.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

tutes duties and prohibitions for man contrary to the natural law, then that law is not a reliable guide. In this hypothesis, however, God would indeed have played a sorry trick on man. He would have given him a nature with certain inclinations or tendencies, a reason by which (and only by which) he can recognize these natural tendencies and formulate moral judgments based upon them, and at the same time have left him in a position in which he is fatally and inexorably impelled to error because these natural guides can be false leaders—contrary to the *will* of God.

Let us, for a moment, develop a bit more fully the notion of natural law. Natural law, it is clear, does not depend on any created will. As a matter of fact, as long as man remains a man, natural law is not subject to change even by the will of God Himself. Perhaps this statement demands some explanation. Of course, natural law depends on the will of God in this sense, that God freely willed to create man with a particular essence or nature. But once man is created, the inclinations which are the basis of the natural law flow from his very essence and are inextricably bound up with it, just as the properties of a circle flow from the nature of a circle so that, for instance, we can never have a circle whose circumference contains a right angle. God can "change" the natural law only by changing the nature of man.

We can, then, Dr. Niebuhr notwithstanding, trust the natural law without fearing that God will arbitrarily change it and neglect to let us in on the secret.

Of course we have the "awful responsibility of seeking to do God's will amidst all the complexities of human existence." The implication that this is more strongly recognized by Protestantism than by Catholicism is hardly worthy of a serious writer on theology. The question is: *how do we know what is God's will?* The Catholic position is that we can recognize the will of God both through reason (in the general tenets of the natural law, for instance, and in the particular, practical judgments of conscience), and through faith, by which we receive the revelation He has vouchsafed to us and transmits through the infallible Church of Jesus Christ by which He speaks to us. Dr. Niebuhr leaves us in an unenviable position: he denounces the "pretensions" of a Church which claims to be the instrument through which God

speaks to men,[8] and he discounts the power of reason and the efficacy of the natural law.

Professor Niebuhr does maintain that the life of Christ is the revelation of the will of God. Certainly it is, in the sense that Christ is our Exemplar, the Model after whom we must fashion our lives. But the application of the principles of action expressed in the life of our Lord to the situations we meet in our own life is a work of *reason*; if reason is incapable of being depended upon in the matter of natural law, how can it be more dependable in the conclusions it draws from the life of Christ?

Dr. Niebuhr's position that the will of God is our only norm still leaves us with no way of finding out what God's will is. Now Dr. Niebuhr's words have a very pleasant sound, and an aura of high idealism (no vulgar reliance on human reason!). But when he is through, this reader at least was unable to find anything to guide him, on Dr. Neibuhr's principles, but Dr. Niebuhr himself—and what Dr. Niebuhr is guided by does not seem to be too certain. This is why we have termed Dr. Niebuhr's argument semi-theological; the theological words are there, but the content has somehow evaporated. And we must confess that, far from being an achievement in moral theology, Dr. Niebuhr's arguments seem to us to be its ultimate bankruptcy.

Dr. Niebuhr's third basis for his position need not delay us long: Catholic teaching is wrong in relying upon a human reason which it considers essentially unvitiated by the Fall.[9] Those who recall Dr. Niebuhr's own utterly fantastic idea of the Fall of Man, and his rejection of the Biblical "myth,"[10] will realize why we term his position quasi-Scriptural, with the accent very definitely on the "quasi." Moreover, the necessity of relying on reason as a guide is still with us even in the fallen state of humanity.

So much for Dr. Niebuhr's basic criticism of the natural law—that it places undue confidence in human reason. Let us now examine briefly his idea of Catholic moral teaching as it exists

[8] Cf. "Reinhold Niebuhr and the Catholic Church. Part II: The 'Intolerance' of Catholicism," *AER*, CXI, 6 (Dec. 1944), 401-18.

[9] Cf. Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, I, 275-81.

[10] Cf. "Reinhold Niebuhr and the Catholic Church. Part One," *AER*, CXI, 5 (Nov. 1944), p. 328.

under the influence of "Catholic natural law." Dr. Niebuhr writes:

> Catholic theories of "natural law" are no less pretentious than secular theories, even though they subordinate the virtue of justice, enjoined in the natural law, to the virtue of love, achieved by grace. According to Catholic theory "natural law" is the part of the "divine" or the "eternal" law which is manifested in human reason. The endless relativities of historical rational perspectives are obscured. This unconditioned claim for an essentially universal reason is the basis of the remarkable degree of certainty with which Catholic moral theology is able to define "justice" and "injustice" in every possible situation.[11]

The clear assumption which may be drawn from these words of Dr. Niebuhr, and from other of his sentiments which we have quoted already,[12] is this: Catholic theology sets up certain general rules which it applies universally, failing to take into account the individual occasion and the uniqueness of the individual who faces the occasion.

Dr. Niebuhr's idea of Catholic moral theology will come as quite a shock to those who teach moral theology in our seminaries, and to priests in the pastoral ministry acquainted with the problems of the confessional. Catholic priests will remember the difficulty and the labor connected with their training in moral theology—a training which stressed two things: the science of the principles, and the art of applying them to individual cases.

The great principle of the natural law, "Do good and avoid evil," is, as we have remarked, immediately evident. The immediate conclusions of the natural law are easily arrived at; but the remote conclusions, entailing a more or less elaborate rational process, the interpretation of facts, and often the consideration of a highly complicated set of circumstances, are, very frequently, difficult to formulate. There can be, and is, diversity in the solutions to particular problems proposed by Catholic moral theologians. Even a cursory familiarity with the writings of modern Catholic moralists (a familiarity which Dr. Niebuhr may possess, but of which he gives no evidence in *The Nature and Destiny of Man*) would convince one of the difficulty of determing "justice and injustice" in many particular

[11] Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, II, 253 n.

[12] Cf. *supra*, pp. 81, 84.

occasions. "The natural law is not a collection of directions cut to fit every particular instance, but rather the great canon containing the fundamental commands whose violation will unsettle the basis of human society."[13] But if moral theology is difficult even when we accept the natural law, it would be in utter confusion without it. And to reject the whole idea of natural law because of the difficulty of application in particular cases would be like cutting off the baby's head because we found it hard to buy him a bonnet. "The endless relativities of historical rational perspectives" are far from being "obscured" in Catholic moral theology. Catholic moral theologians do insist that there are eternal and universal perspectives in the light of which the relativities must be judged, however difficult the judgment. And, incidentally, how could we speak of relative perspectives at all, unless by comparison with absolute ones?

Dr. Niebuhr, in the discussion of the failings of "Catholic natural law," does not often come down to particular cases; which is, we think, wise on his part. When he does, the result is not a happy one. So as not to prolong this article unduly, we will examine only one of his concrete examples:

> In Catholic natural law all social relations, including family relations, are precisely defined. *Inter alia* it is maintained that the natural law prohibits birth control. . . . The prohibition of birth control assumes that the sexual function in human life must be limited to its function in nature, that of procreation. But it is the very character of human life that all animal functions are touched by freedom and released into more complex relationships. This freedom is the basis of both creativity and sin. Freedom in relation to sex may occasion license and it may also provide for a creative relation between the sexual impulse and other more complex and refined spiritual impulses. In its teachings in regard to sex, Catholic theories of natural law might actually be more plausibly expressed in terms of the Lutheran concept of "order of creation" or *"Schoepfungsordnung."* For the concept of "order of creation" limits the law to a natural fact, such as natural bisexuality for instance, and does not introduce some specious universality of reason. It is not possible to escape the natural fact that the primary purpose of bisexuality in nature is that of procreation. But it is not easy to establish a universally valid "law of reason" which will eternally set the bounds

[13] Hans Meyer, *The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1944), p. 473.

for the function of sex in the historic development of human personality.[14]

This example given by Dr. Niebuhr would seem to call for a few remarks:

(1) It is not true that "in Catholic natural law all social relationships . . . are precisely defined." The great fundamental principles are given, but the Catholic, or the Catholic moralist, is not fettered in a strait-jacket of detail. The natural tendencies of man as a social animal, for example, make it in accord with natural law that he live peacefully in community with his fellows, but natural law does not prescribe the precise technical form of government.

(2) Dr. Niebuhr is perfectly right in stating that Catholics maintain that birth control is prohibited by the natural law. An examination of the objective facts of the case convinces man that the natural result of the sexual act between man and woman is the conception of the child. From this natural result he can reason to the fact that the primary purpose of the sexual act and of the sexual organs is the perpetuation of the race. To frustrate artificially the natural result of the sexual act is, therefore, a violation of the natural law. So much is clear. Dr. Niebuhr maintains that "the prohibition of birth control assumes that the sexual function in human life must be limited to its function in nature, that of procreation." These words are ambiguous, and the confusion results from the word "limited." While the marital act may not be performed in an unnatural fashion, it certainly does have a higher significance than the sexual act in "nature," by which Dr. Niebuhr must mean "brute nature" if his words are to have any sense. A study of the Catholic doctrine of marriage, including a reading of *Casti connubii*, would no doubt be rewarding as well as revealing to Professor Niebuhr; it would have saved him the pretentious absurdity of writing that "it is the very character of human life that all animal relationships are touched by freedom and released into more complex relationships," as if this were somehow denied by Catholic moral theology, and as if Catholic moral theologians were in need of this salutary reminder from Dr. Niebuhr.

[14] Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, I, 281 f.

(3) We wish the reader would pay particular attention to Dr. Niebuhr's sentence: "Freedom in relation to sex may occasion license and it may also provide for a creative relation between the sexual impulse and other more complex and refined spiritual impulses." "Freedom in relation to sex may occasion license . . . ." Does Dr. Niebuhr mean freedom of sex relations outside of marriage? If he does, is not such freedom *already* "license"? Does he even restrict his "freedom in relation to sex" by confining it to relations between the sexes? In *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, T. E. Lawrence reports that some of those accompanying him in the desert campaign justified homosexual relations between Arab soldiers on the grounds that "this sterile process" was a "sensual co-efficient of the mental passion which was welding our souls and spirits in one flaming effort."[15] This would seem to be, in practice, a perfect example of Dr. Niebuhr's moral theory. There is certainly present "freedom in relation to sex"; there is, after a fashion, a "more complex and refined spiritual impulse." Now, we do not for one moment imagine that Dr. Niebuhr would condone homosexuality. But on what grounds can he condemn it and remain consistent with his principles? He certainly cannot condemn it as "unnatural"; the very thing he is trying to demolish is the tyranny of a universal rational law limiting the freedom of sex. Dr. Niebuhr, we fear, should have confined himself to vague generalities; because when we try to see how his idealistic "liberal" view of morality can be reduced to concrete cases, we are confronted with what seems to verge on nonsense, and dangerous nonsense at that.

(4) Just as the Catholic moral theologian (unhampered by Dr. Niebuhr's theories) can condemn homosexuality as unnatural; so, for the same reason, can he condemn birth control. And he does not introduce "some *specious* universality of reason." He looks at human nature, and at human inclinations; he perceives that nature imposes limits which may not be infringed. In regard to birth control, he maintains that, while certainly the marital act provides for complex and refined spiritual impulses, it must not be performed unnaturally, and it must not be artificially frustrated.

(5) We confess that Professor Niebuhr's next-to-last sentence puzzles us. "It is not possible to escape the natural fact that the

[15] (New York: Garden City Publishing Co., 1938), p. 30

primary purpose of bisexuality in nature is that of procreation." The words are true enough. But what are they doing in Dr. Niebuhr's context? Unless we are mistaken, he is trying to prove that we must not be bound by this natural fact—at least to the extent of setting up a universal law based on it. And yet, in his own words, this is a natural fact from which "it is not possible to escape."

(6) Dr. Niebuhr's last sentence, "But it is not easy to establish a universally valid 'law of reason' which will eternally set the bounds for the function of sex in the historic development of human personality," harks back to the old misunderstanding. There may be, in a sense, an "historic development of human personality": but there is no historic development of human *nature*. Human nature, in every man and woman, is the same as the human nature of the first man and woman. It is human nature which forbids the artificial frustration of birth; and human "personality," whatever its "historic development," will never justify it. In this particular case, the natural law imposes, if you will, a negative precept. It does "eternally set the bounds for the function of sex" in the sense that it forbids the use of the sexual powers in an unnatural fashion. It does not impose any limits on the high spiritual significance of the marital act properly performed in the sanctified union of husband and wife. In other words, the Catholic teaching on sex lacks nothing of the loftiness which Dr. Niebuhr implies is missing; but it does avoid the undisciplined absurdity which results from a rejection of the natural law.

We would like to call attention to only one other feature of Dr. Niebuhr's criticism of Catholic moral teaching. "The whole imposing structure of Thomistic ethics," he writes, "is, in one of its aspects, no more than a religious sanctification of the relativities of the feudal social system as it flowered in the thirteenth century."[16] "The social ethics of Thomas Aquinas embody the peculiarities and the contingent factors of a feudal-agrarian economy into a system of fixed socio-ethical principles."[17] Is this an implication that Catholic social teaching was "frozen" in the thirteenth century? (We wish Dr. Niebuhr had thought to give some examples of feudal "peculiarities" which St. Thomas

[16] Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, I, 221.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

had erected into universal socio-ethical principles.) The truth of the matter is that Catholic moral teachings have neglected neither universal principles nor the peculiar circumstances of succeeding ages; but have ministered to the common good of mankind by applying the principles of natural and divinely-revealed law to the particular needs of the time. The Fathers of the Church did this; St. Thomas Aquinas did it; Pope Leo XIII did it; Pope Pius XI did it; and Pope Pius XII is doing it. We can only wearily repeat that Dr. Niebuhr has apparently not taken the trouble to examine the teaching against which he is hurling the old shibboleths and repeating the old libels.

One final word before we close this section on Catholic moral teachings. It does seem strange; but Dr. Niebuhr, who objects so much to the absolutism of Catholicism, does not hesitate himself to make statements about man, personality, character, the Church, etc., which are certainly very definite statements—certainly "absolutes," if not "religious absolutes." And his pronouncements are not even based on principles for which a universal validity, by the widest stretch of the imagination, could be claimed. They seem, on the contrary, to be the product of that peculiar atmosphere of "liberal" thought, false mysticism, personal exegesis, doubtful philosophy, and prejudice against Catholicism which seems to affect fatally even some of the best intentioned of the writers on religion outside of the Catholic Church. This is a distressing phemonenon, but not by any means a new one. Dr. Niebuhr is not the first to write in this fashion, nor, we fear, will he be the last.

* * * * *

Time magazine has remarked of *The Nature and Destiny of Man* that it makes out "a vigorous case against Catholicism."[18] Its "vigor" we do not deny; but we fail to see now it could be considered a "case against Catholicism" by any but a very particular and receptive type of audience. Dr. Niebuhr's view of history, where it touches upon Catholicism, seems to be informed by an uncritical bias. His ideas of Catholic teaching, while very postively (almost pontifically) presented, are often incorrect to the point of being humorous. His criticism of Catholic "intolerance" misunderstands the very nature of tolerance and, however innocently, misrepresents the attitude of the

[18] *Time.*, XXXVII, 38 (March 24, 1941), 39.

Church towards the adherents of other religions. His "moral theology" lacks foundation either in reason or in revelation, and seems to us to be the complete antithesis of sound thinking on moral problems.

These three articles have constituted a somewhat lengthy examination of Dr. Niebuhr's *The Nature and Destiny of Man.* More could have been said, certainly; but we have tried to confine our comments to what appeared to be the major points. We believed that the readers of this *Review* would be interested in a consideration of Dr. Niebuhr's arguments not only because *The Nature and Destiny of Man* has been hailed by non-Catholic critics as an important work, but because we feel that it reflects an attitude towards the Catholic Church which is all too common among non-Catholic writers. This attitude cannot be ignored by Catholic priests, however irritating and, ultimately, sorrow-provoking, they find it.

The irritating aspect of this attitude is, of course, the air of calm, superior, impartial scholarship which many modern non-Catholic writers assume when they speak of things Catholic. No organization on earth is more anxious than the Catholic Church that men examine in the light of reason the claims it makes upon them. It does, however, ask for a fair trial; and an imitation of impartiality, however plausible it may be on the surface, is no substitute for the real thing. But non-Catholic religious writers continue to sit in judgment on the Church of Jesus Christ; they offer their own evidence, at their own pleasure; they interpret facts their own way; they are prosecutor, judge, and jury; they even, sometimes, in a rather half-hearted fashion, play the role of counsel for the defence, taking care, to paraphrase Dr. Johnson, that the Catholics do not have the best of it; and then they hand down their decision.

The sorrowful part of the situation is this: sometimes these writers do not even seem to suspect that they are being unfair to the Catholic Church. They never seem to question whether the grim, bloody, arrogant, intolerant, and stupid monster which centuries of lies and prejudice have constructed and named the Catholic Church is really that Church or a product of diseased imaginations. They are the victims of a bias which they have come to take for granted. And in taking it for granted they become, unfortunately, contributors to it in their turn.

This sad situation becomes tragic when it can, to a certain degree, affect a man like Reinhold Niebuhr, whom we believed, and still believe, to be sincere. We hope that he will not be satisfied with a sorry mess of pottage in place of the birth-right of men whom Christ redeemed. We hope that he will not be satisfied, either with his own attempts to build a satisfactory philosophy of life without bothering with a sound foundation, or with his present impression of the Catholic Church.

We have written rather strongly about Dr. Niebuhr's criticisms of Catholicism because we consider them to be an unwarranted, uninformed, and unfounded attack upon something every Catholic holds very dear. But our remarks were never meant, nor do we believe that they can be construed, as an attack upon the man himself. We respect Dr. Niebuhr for what we believe to be his sincerity of purpose. We are grateful for the flashes of psychological insight which enlighten many of his pages. We admire the high moral idealism which shines through the faulty philosophy and misinformation of *The Nature and Destiny of Man*. We believe that Reinhold Niebuhr is searching for the truth. We hope and pray, and presume to ask our readers to pray, that God be with him in his search for it, and that he find it in the end.

EDMOND DARVIL BENARD

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Parade, the weekly magazine supplement which appears with several Sunday newspapers, carried on the cover of its Thanksgiving number a picture of a Puritan maiden supposedly illustrating "the spirit of stern piety with which the early settlers celebrated the first American Thanksgiving." The dour Puritan elders would have been given a severe shock by this particular maiden. She held, very conspicuously a copy of Fr. Lasance's *My Prayer Book*. A fifth-columnist, perhaps? . . . And speaking of books, there has come to the attention of the far-flung *AER* intelligence service (no comments, *please*) the story of the very nice and pious old lady who wished to give an appropriately spiritual book as a Christmas gift to a young seminarian. So she sent him *The Saint Omnibus.*

RECTORY ON WHEELS

Every rectory has a whole variety of experiences to offer to a priest. But its variety is limited, for a rectory stays in the same spot year after year and deals with the people of the same parish territory. If the reader will imagine a rectory put on wheels, moving into a strange territory each week, and meeting new people each day, he will have some idea of what life is like on a trailer motor mission in Texas. This summer the Paulist Fathers assigned Fr. Gouch and myself to just such a rectory on wheels.

To meet a Catholic in these old sun-bleached towns of Texas was an exceptional event. In working out of the city of Austin through these little hamlets of six and seven hundred people we found our chief task was to convince these residents of the "Bible Belt" that priests were real human beings and that the Catholic Church was alive even though the Spanish missionaries who built "The Alamo" were long since dead.

Prejudice and misinformation regarding Catholicism was a commonplace. But we found, for the most part, that these people of the soil were frank, honest, and willing to give us a hearing. Their sincere and favorable reactions were evident in every town. For example, one evening in Leander just about dusk, a strapping cedar-cutter came down from the hills. He slapped us on the back and then went on to explain that he and all his relatives had always believed that priests were all sorts of things and that they used to lock up little girls in their basements. Then he said, "You know, listening to you fellows talk and seeing your pictures has made us all realize that priests are really quite human." And he said it without a smile.

But Leander wasn't the only scene of a successful invasion by priests. Each week we moved into another Protestant stronghold and carried on a regular shock-troop campaign of clearing away barricades of misunderstanding and prejudice. The plan of attack was simple enough. The basic technique was worked out long ago in the successful missions opened up by the Paulists in Tennessee. Modern equipment and good salesmanship are the real keys to effective propaganda.

Our gun-metal gray streamlined trailer "The Saint Rita" makes an effective "General Grant" tank for the Church Militant.

Within it are living quarters for two priests and an altar for saying Mass. The microphone attached to the powerful public address system is a most effective weapon. The back of the trailer opens up to form a regular stage set-up, with a platform and flood-lights. Bracketed on the side is a large movie screen. An electric victrola, a movie projector, and a set of films of the life of Christ and other subjects complete our mobile equipment. With such a rectory on wheels it is an easy task to draw to the town lot residents from the whole countryside. As they sprawl on the grass or sit in their dusty cars we are able to present to them an entertaining and instructive program on the Catholic Church.

The first day's entrance into a town entails a varied round of activities. Most towns have their own sheriffs and mayors. These men of authority, though "gun-shy" of strangers, are usually very respectful. Permission for the town lot is readily given us after a bit of a sales talk about presenting a free movie along with some religious lectures for the townsfolk. In one place the only man of authority was the banker—a large "broth" of a man who looked down the end of his nose with a fish-eyed stare and said, "What yo'all want?" After we had asked him about the sheriff he replied, "Wal, you know the old saying hereabouts is that west of the San Gabriel there ain't no authority. I'm the banker and I guard my own bank. There's the town lot over there. Old man Madden has no business having his cow in there. You just run it right out o' there." However, we found the aged Mr. Madden quite willing to give up his use of the green pasture for a week in the interests of religion.

Usually, as soon as we had parked the trailer and started to clean up the town lot, barefooted country urchins would come swarming around us, ready to help us cut the grass. Once the trailer was located on the lot, a large red, white, and blue sign was set up. In bold letters it announced to passersby that they would have the opportunity to see free movies on the life of Christ and hear lectures on "What you should know about Catholics." Old Glory and the Lone Star flag of Texas were unfurled on either side of the sign. Seeing priests working in the hot sun, cutting grass and cleaning up the show grounds, was always an effective salestalk with the people, who would stop by on the road side to stare at us. After the work was done, our

group of young helpers was taken over to the drug store for a treat of ice-cream. We found their pudgy hands eager for Catholic medals which they were allowed to keep as long as their parents did not object. (Incidentally, there were no "rejects.") Through the enthusiasm of these new-found friends, along with the placards which were tacked up on the telephone poles, the news of the Catholic mission was well known throughout the whole countryside long before sunset of the first day.

The first three days were always the most difficult. A very intensive campaign was necessary to prepare for the reception of Catholic truth. We had to be constantly on the alert to make friends and break down aloofness and suspicion. Buying razor-blades and knicknacks from the store proprietors, and eating in the local restaurants gave us the opportunity for conversation and friendliness. Getting a shave in the town barbershop was always a good opening, and a little knowledge of hunting, farming, or fishing led the townsfolk on to telling of their exploits with rod and gun. Fr. Gouch's "apostolate of the camera" among the children, taking their pictures and mailing the prints back to them later on, was one of the best methods of making friends with both young and old. Going fishing with the men and swimming with the boys had an effectiveness all of its own. The youngsters had "never seen preachers swim before," they told us. One day we had difficulty getting one boy to jump in. He gave his reason for staying out to one of the other boys: "I'm a Baptist and those preachers are liable to try and baptize me all over again in the 'crick.'"

Through this intensive good will campaign we were able to get at least a third of the people to attend our evening program. But the number who actually came to the lot itself was not always the major indication of success. Our powerful public address system carried well on the night air, indeed so well that it dominated the whole town. It was a rare front porch that did not have more than one set of ears cocked to hear every word of Catholic truth that punctuated the quiet summer evenings during the whole week. In this way nothing of the Catholic service was missed and the front porch listeners lost no face with their Protestant neighbors.

One of the towns was very difficult to break down. The City Marshall gave us an extremely indefinite sort of permission and

then two days later attempted to bluff us about the volume of the radio. We gave him a five minute lecture on Liberty, Free Speech, and Texas, and concluded with: "The majority of people here want to hear the program. That's why you see them every night on their porches. The only ones complaining are a small group of cranks. And no small group like that ought to be able to prevent the majority of people from listening to what they have a right to hear. That's just plain Democracy and that's what our boys are fighting for over in Europe." The beady-eyed little official immediately exonerated himself of any part in the complaint and blamed the group which had put the pressure on him. Knowing who this minority group was, it was the complaints that subsided—not our volume. On the last night during the talk on "Why I Am A Catholic" we turned up the volume dial to its highest notch and shook the trees on the nearby hills with the reasons why the Catholic Church was the true church.

The regular program was scheduled Monday through Friday every evening from eight-thirty to ten. The first half-hour consisted of a musical program that opened with the stirring "The Eyes Of Texas Are Upon You." Then followed a medley of the old-time hymns, organ music, and Catholic melodies. The electric victrola acted as a veritable "Gabriel's Horn" in drawing people out of their homes and over to the town lot. At nine o'clock a little talk of welcome was given to the crowd. We explained that our purpose was not to attack any particular religion or to arouse controversy, but to clear away any misunderstandings regarding their fellow Texan Catholics and the Catholic Church to which they belonged. Questions were encouraged and courteous answers promised. The next ten minutes were taken up by a short comedy which put everyone in good humor. After that, a twenty minute Question Box period, followed by a half-hour picture on the Life of Christ. Finally, we gave a half-hour talk on positive Catholic doctrine. Then the program came to an end. As the crowd broke up and headed for home under the stars, "The Eyes Of Texas Are Upon You" once again filled the night air as we bade good night and God's blessing upon them.

The Question Box period was always interesting and consisted in answering the usual bromides of the Bible Belt—pretty much

the same questions in all the towns: "What's the difference between you priests and a minister?" "Don't you Catholics adore images and statues in your churches?" "Why don't priests marry?" "Why can't Catholics eat meat on Friday?" "Doesn't the Catholic Church forbid Catholics to read the Bible?" "Why do they call you priests 'Father'?" "Where does the Bible speak of Purgatory?" "Do you claim to have the power to forgive sins?" "Isn't it true that the Catholic Church locks up women in buildings all their lives?" "Why is the Catholic service always in Latin?" and so on . . . .

The honest comments made by the people after hearing the answers to the questions were always very encouraging. A typical one was that expressed by a listener in Marble Falls who came up after the service and said, "I've listened to you priests for two nights. Biggest awakening in my life! I've heard you answer questions and talk of the love of Jesus. I always thought you worshipped statues and the Lord's mother. I've made up my mind that I would never again believe anything said against the Catholic Church by the other fellow. From now on I got to go right into the Church and see if it can be proved!"

Very often the more timid enquirers arranged to see us privately in the trailer to unburden troubling questions regarding Catholicism. One old man drove in some twenty miles one day to ask us if it were true that the Catholic Church "locked up women in buildings all their lives." Full of interest, he listened to the short history of the anchorites and of the gradual formation of religious communities to help individuals who had voluntarily left the world in order to give themselves up completely to the love of God through prayer and penance. His gimlet-like eyes gleamed from under his semi-wimpled old felt hat as he sat there in baggy clothes, his sunken jowls in need of a shave. And we couldn't help but smile when, after we had finished answering his question, he looked at both of us very intently and said, "You know, if I were a woman I could see myself becoming a nun any day." He did not, however, evince any desire to become a Catholic.

In giving the half-hour lectures on positive Catholic doctrine we followed a very simple method worked out by Fathers Overend, Gouch and McDonnell earlier in the summer. With all these people in the different towns there was one common

denominator that could usually be counted on. That was a love of Jesus and a love of the Bible. Using these two points as a sort of beach-head, it was easy to advance quickly into solid Catholic doctrine. The psychology behind all the sermons could be summed up something like this: "You love Jesus and the Bible and so do we. And we have everything that you have but also a lot more. But everything that you have and everything that we have we all got from the Catholic Church. And that's why we love the Church."

On the first night we always presented the psychological argument for the necessity of religion and stress was laid on the Catholic Church's constant encouraging of people all down through the centuries to know and love Jesus better. The second evening followed up with an exposition of the Church's teaching on Jesus Christ as true God and true man. The talk was purposely interlarded with scriptural quotations which these people love to hear. Wednesday's subject "The Catholic Church and the Bible" was always an eye-opener for all of them. They had never heard before that they had received the Bible from the Catholic Church. On Thursday night we told them of the nature and the richness of the sacramental life of the Church, and gently but firmly stressed the point: "You have only one sacrament, where are the other six?" Friday was always the final punch night. The subject was, "Why I am a Catholic" and no punches were pulled in proving the divinity and the necessity of the Church. This talk was always prefaced with a few words of gratitude to all for their hospitality and kind reception. At the same time we announced the giving out of "souvenir pamphlets" of our week's mission in their town.

The title of the pamphlet is *What You Should Know About Catholics*. Within it is much solid meat on Catholic truth and an address for those who wish to write for further information. We found nearly everyone ready and grateful to receive it. On the last night in Georgetown we were given a bit of a set-back. Fr. Gouch made the announcement and I had just started down among the crowd to hand out pamphlets when a small group at the rear began to hiss. I started to walk towards them to ask what the trouble was. When I was about ten paces away there was a sudden leaden silence. I proceeded to the nearest one and thrust a pamphlet in his direction. Taken back by this turn of

tactic, he took the pamphlet and all the rest followed his example. None of them realized, I hope, that I was even more surprised than they were when they took the pamphlets.

The preceding paragraphs give a brief survey of the procedure followed in each week's stay in these towns. Our stay ended Saturday morning, when we bade good-bye to the residents and moved on to the next hamlet. Always, people came up to wish us good luck, to say thanks, and even to invite us to be sure and be back next year. To recall a week's sojourn in a town is to look back on a whole kaleidoscope of scenes and people, humorous incidents and quaint characters, picturesque sheriffs and rustic mayors, tawny-colored old towns with tired old buildings, and dusty roads that seemed to have no end. There were ministers who dined with us and ministers who argued with us, but none with whom we compromised. Monday's hostile stares melted into Saturday's friendly smiles, which sometimes even resulted in a free breakfast. There were scenes of cutting grass and of driving cows out of town lots. We recall shaking off red ants and avoiding rattlers. We remember rigging up telephone poles for electric current, ignoring the whine of mosquitoes and the buzz of June bugs as they cavorted in the trailer at night, cooling off in mud creeks, encountering curious types of cuisine in "one arm" restaurants. And a whole medley of "yo'all's" and "sure nuff's" is ringing in our ears. Each town deserves a chapter all it's own.

Obviously, it would be impossible at present to venture any certain predictions regarding either the actual results of the work done or the result of future work. One thing is certain: that the making of converts in any large numbers in these towns can only be accomplished after a gradual softening-up process. The arsenals of bigotry and prejudice must first be exploded. Only then can inquiry and Bible classes and concentrated follow-up work be carried on successfully. All this entails long range, tedious work, and the meeting of periods of bitter opposition. But this latter has been met and successfully dealt with in Tennessee. As the work pushes forward its frontiers, it still continues to reap a rich harvest of converts from the territory that has already been processed.

The possibilities and prospects in Texas do seem favorable. Protestantism, the greatest barrier to Catholicism, is still strong; but it is definitely crumbling from within. The real basis of its

unity is not doctrine, but rather the personality of the local minister and the social relations of the people. And even these have lost their effectiveness through the divisions of the various Protestant sects. In discussions with the younger set of ministers, we found them critical of the old emotionalism and desirous of substituting in its place a more intellectual form of religion. But, judging from their own statements, the substitute they propose seems nothing more than a syncretism of other religions and a hodgepodge of Kantianism, psychology, and modern "science." At the heart of it is a new form of emotionalism with a superficial facade formed by a rich embroidery of Scripture.

The most significant factor regarding the future of Catholicism in rural Texas is the people themselves. On the whole we found them frank, honest, and ready to face facts. They are ardent believers in free speech and in hearing both sides of a question. Their hospitality and kind reception are important factors. It is encouraging to note that they do write back for further information regarding Catholicism. They still have a real interest in religion and in Jesus Christ. And the natural virtue of these country people is good ground for the seed of faith to grow in, if it be God's will that it take root. Perhaps some day the people of Texas will venerate "The Alamo" as much for being a mission and a symbol of the Catholic Faith as for being a fortress and the symbol of the independence of the Lone Star State.

WALTER P. BURKE, C.S.P.

St. Paul's College,
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

"The Conversion of the Mohammedans through their Faith in the One Merciful God" is the Mission Intention for the month of February, 1945.

SHOULD PRIESTS PRAY THE MASS?

One of the minor psychological revolutions of the twentieth century is the extent to which the Catholic laity has now been persuaded "to pray the Mass" from the missal. This came home to me, for instance, on visiting an old and apparently eternally-established prayerbook publication house, where generations of Catholics had obtained their *Keys of Heaven*, *Gardens of the Soul*, and other "standard" manuals in English, German, French, Italian, Polish, and the like. Within two decades that entire trade, in both its publishing and its importing branches, has dwindled to near-extinction: the present generation, convinced now that they should not only pray during Mass, but pray the Mass, will have but one book in hand, the missal. In fact, did we not see an enterprising missal publisher urging the slogan, "No missal, no Mass"? The present article would raise the question as to the propriety of priests, when assisting at Mass, similarly praying the Mass. The point of departure may be said to be this challenge made by a layman: "All right: the laity are now sold on praying the Mass; how about the priests?"

The writer confesses that it is after much hesitation that he broaches the question. If the matter has been discussed in print before, he has missed it. Nor does he recall its coming up in any of our American Liturgical Weeks, or at the Priests' Liturgical School at Mundelein, or similar meetings, where both the *festina* and the *lente* side of all arguments bubbled freely. The writer would doubtless have refrained longer from initiating such discussion, had not such a challenge been received under circumstances to be mentioned below. To meet that challenge with silence might mean incurring a higher challenge later on: *vae mihi quia tacui.*

The matter is doubtless one of those aspects of the reform of public worship that has been implicit in the program all along, one that the logic of developments now begins to make explicit. For clarity's sake suppose we put the question in the form of a case: Father X urges his people to avoid all irrelevant prayers during Mass, and (if at all possible) to follow Mass by using the missal. But when Father X himself assists at Mass in public, a Low Mass or a High Mass, in his own church or abroad, he reads

his breviary throughout. Is there, however unintentionally, a lack of reflection in such a custom? Is Father X undermining the effect of his preaching? Or, aside entirely from all question of his people, is Father X missing glory for God and graces for himself in choosing a *second-best* method of assisting at this Mass? The matter is worth some thought.

Father X has strong arguments for winning the people to assist at Mass in the best manner possible for them, and he has shown both zeal and patience over a long period in carrying out that word of Pius XI: "One should seek to elevate this [non-liturgical] prayer little by little, and to teach the faithful to pray as she [the Church] prays," Father X recently reinforced his exhortations with the eloquence borrowed from Archbishop Beckman's pastoral:

> There are many kinds of prayer, my dearly beloved children, but the most complete and powerful prayer is the prayer of Christ Himself—that mighty summary of God's infinite love for man, that sublime and perfect sacrifice—*the holy Mass.* . . . All other prayers should be merged and submerged in this supreme and perfect prayer. . . . We are privileged to participate intimately in that act. "You are a royal priesthood," exclaimed St. Peter of us all. Praying the Mass therefore is as much your business as it is that of the priest.[1]

Father X previously repeated over and over words from the new Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*: "Public prayers, prayers, that is, that are offered by Mother Church, because of the dignity of the Spouse of Christ, excel any other kind of prayer; but no prayer, even the most private, lacks its own dignity and power . . . . In this act of Sacrifice . . . the faithful themselves with one desire and one prayer offer it [the Mass] to the eternal Father."[2] With an abundance of such materials at hand, Father X has been tireless in urging the better over the good: *aemulamini autem charismata meliora.*

But has the Church in this matter a blessing only for the laity? Has she not reserved for us also a blessing? Father X has not forgotten the words of Urban VIII at the head of the Roman Missal: "If there is one thing in human life absolutely divine, one thing that the citizens of Heaven might envy, if envy were

[1] *Orate Fratres*, XVIII, 6 (April 1944), 276.

[2] America Press edition, nn. 107, 97.

consistent with their state, it is the holy Sacrifice of the Mass. . . . Accordingly the more must men endeavor to hold a privilege so great in becoming honor and reverence." He recalls too that the Fathers of Trent were persuaded: "And if we must needs confess that no other work can be performed by the faithful so holy and divine as this tremendous mystery itself . . . it is also sufficiently clear that all industry and diligence is to be applied to this end, that it be performed with the greatest possible . . . outward show of devotion and piety."[3] These authoritative words are very useful in stiffening the laymen's sense of obligation to treat such a holy thing in the holiest possible manner, but Father X will not overlook that in these contexts Mother Church addresses us priests, urging us to make the best use of the Mass. It is in connection with Mass-worship that Pius XI, in his Encyclical on Reparation to the Most Sacred Heart, quotes the strong language of St. Cyprian: "The Sacrifice of our Saviour is not celebrated with the requisite sanctity if our own offering and our own sacrifice of self do not correspond . . . " Is it in any degree robbing the Sacrifice of Christ of some of its requisite sanctity, if priests pray their Office instead of praying the Mass?

"NO TIME IS LOST"

Father X realizes that, in urging the laity at public worship to rise above personal prayer-preferences and march with the regiment, he is urging them to a *higher form* of worship. It is not at all a question of right or wrong, but one of the best and the less good. Liturgical prayer, Pope Pius XII has expressly said in *Mystici Corporis*, excels any other kind of prayer: it is in this form of prayer that the Church is asking this "new" *actuosa participatio*, the phase used by Pius XI in *Divini cultus* (1928). So, during Mass, aside with private prayers, and pray instead the Mass. Of course, the breviary is liturgical prayer, as official as can be, and moreover related to Mass like hand and glove, and so there could be no quarrel with a priest (or Sisters, or with the laity) reading the breviary during Mass. Or could there? The breviary is fashioned of liturgical prayer, related to Mass, not like hand and glove, but rather like *arm* to *hand*, in that it is the approach to and the path from the holy altar of Sacrifice.

[3] Sess. XII.

"Possunt defectus occurrere . . . si celebrans saltem Matutinum cum Laudibus non dixerit," reads a reminder in the missal. In our physical well-being eating and sleeping are very closely interrelated, but they cannot for all that be pursued at once. The breviary is not prayer so arranged as to enable one to follow and be part of the communal action being led by the celebrant. Neither in Rodriguez, nor in Marmion, nor in Hedley, nor in Tanquerey, does one find the suggestion made by the masters of the spiritual life to use the breviary as an aid for the better following of Mass. The point in the dictum, "Do not only pray during Mass, pray the Mass," seems to be as pertinent to prayer drawn from the canonical hours as from non-liturgical sources.

Obviously a comparison with the laity cannot in fairness be instituted without recalling that the laity have no obligation to do any specific kind of praying one way or another, whereas priests are under a daily necessity, binding under mortal sin, of reciting the canonical hours. Also it is usually the case that when a priest attends Mass publicly it is after (or before), and in addition to, celebrating the holy Sacrifice himself. His frame of mind, then, as he opens his breviary, could perhaps be expressed as follows: "During *my* Mass I try with all reasonable solicitude to pray my Mass in the least unworthy fashion. In my poor way I try to recall that it is the *sacrificium crucis*. But now, whereas Mass for *me* is over and done, I still have the daily *labor labiorum meorum*, and this *labor est ante me*! I'll save time if I work at it while Father So-and-so celebrates *his* Mass for the people. My *own* Mass was principally for God, but this one is to show respect for one being buried, affection for one being married, or to enable the neighboring pastor to make a good showing at his Forty Hours. For me it's not primarily Mass, and I'll say my Office, so as to be clear for the rest of the day. In that way no time is lost."

No time is lost. The tyranny of terms, and the danger of depreciating language. Priests in their charitable and engaging fashion so often speak of spiritual things in terms of the least pious denominator. Here for instance they mean no more than that, if Office be not recited during Mass, that particular lapse of time finds them no nearer the end of the daily task. But in unreflecting moments the pejorative meaning, from frequent repetition, begins to crowd out the true (but unexpressed)

meaning. Then people act *as if* time would be lost if breviary were not said during Mass, and make such practical canons as this: "I never anticipate if I see a possibility of my assisting at a second Mass: the Office gives me something to do at Mass."

"OBLIGATIONES NON SUNT TELESCOPANDAE"

The Kenrick Seminary in St. Louis has a house-rule bearing on the matter of reading the Divine Office during the celebrating of Holy Mass, the fame of which has spread to Kenrick's credit. Perhaps other seminaries have a similar rule, but it is in connection with Kenrick that I have heard of it. Anxious to be sure of the facts, I applied to the Reverend William A. Flynn, C.M., Professor of Liturgy, asking the precise character of this rule, and anything special in connection with it. Father Flynn's courteous reply reads in part:

> We have a regulation here with regard to the recitation of Divine Office during Mass. The regulation applies to the Third and Fourth Year Theologians. . . . At the beginning of each school year and several times thereafter I read to the students the regulation covering hours and places where they may not recite Office. One of these times is at the Mass at which the student-body goes to Communion, another is the Solemn Mass at which they sing. I explain to the students that the Office is an extra obligation and should not be shucked off during the time of another obligation—attendance at Mass. . . . As to the students' attitude towards the regulation, I know they all realize and appreciate its wisdom; at least no one ever tries to argue about it. . . .
>
> The origin of the regulation, I believe, was in the discipline it promotes, teaching the students to give full attention to each thing when they do it. I found the rule in effect when I came and have not deviated from it at any time. I usually ask erring deacons if they intend to carry a breviary with them to the altar when they celebrate Mass after ordination. . .

An observer will have noted that the Kenrick regulation, as here described, is grounded on the administrative principle often expressed in seminary "slang," *obligationes non sunt telescopandae*, but that, as explained and enforced, it is based on an "unsociability" of simultaneous Mass worship and breviary recitation.

It would be most foolish and no less unjust to imply that priests who recite their Office while assisting at Mass are to be adjudged as derelict or negligent. I cherish the conviction that despite all

the demands of crowded days and nights, the vast majority of priests in their manner of insisting on the *best* for their churches and themselves, will take missals and not breviaries when going to Mass just as soon as they are thoroughly conversant with a "new" idea, one the more elusive since it was not being taught in its present fulness when they were in the seminaries. Fr. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., deservedly one of our best-known theologians, reminds us that *doctrines grow*—and that we must grow with them.

> It must be remembered that a development of Catholic doctrine is possible in the sense that in the course of time the Church can acquire a more profound and more explicit understanding of the revealed truths committed to its custody and a deeper appreciation of the means of holiness encompassed in its ministry. . . . Phases of doctrine and of worship that have come to the fuller consciousness of the Church in recent times and are clearly destined by Providence to be the remedies for the ills of the world, are the doctrine of the Mystical Body . . . and the practices of active assistance at holy Mass and of daily Communion.[4]

Now, prior to the *Deus scientiarum Dominus*, courses in the nature of public worship, and in the corporate character of Christian public worship, were not common in the seminaries, nor are they universal even yet. Some things are far more explicit now than formerly. The singleness of Mass-worship, that the Mass is not merely offered by the celebrant in the *presence* of the congregation, but by the entire congregation through the celebrant, is stated in the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* more clearly than I have ever found it in a class-room manual: "For here the sacred ministers act in the person not only of our Saviour but of the whole Mystical Body and of every one of the faithful. In this act of Sacrifice through the hands of the priest. . . *the faithful themselves* with one desire and one prayer *offer it to the eternal Father*—the most acceptable victim of praise and propitiation for the world's needs."[5] In this "new" theology there is no such thing as *my* Mass now and *another's* at another time, or *before* a congregation, it is always the one and only Mass that matters, conjointly offered by all and the holiest thing within range of human activity. The faithful (priests surely not ex-

[4] *America*, LXIII (1940), 288.
[5] America Press edition, n. 97.

cluded) come to church to derive piety from its chief source, by taking an active part in *these* sacred mysteries. Hence it is now urged, not only to pray during Mass, but to pray the Mass.

It is stated above that this article is evoked by a challenge. Writing on the position and role of nuns in the liturgical movement, I recorded what had been told me by a Sister: "It was an awful shock to us to hear a priest say, jokingly of course, that he intended to erect screens around the Sisters' pews for High Mass, so the people would not have the bad example of the Sisters' saying Office during Mass. But it opened our eyes to the big fact that we go to Mass for the sake of attending to Mass." One can see what would follow. The mail was heavy for some time, and the burden of the letters was: "But how about the priests? Unless they erect screens to hide all the prie-dieux in the sanctuaries, the people will still have the example of the priests saying Office."

I wonder if it would help, meanwhile, to request Benziger's to embody the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass in their "efficiently American" breviaries?

GERALD ELLARD, S. J.

St. Mary's College,
St. Mary's, Kansas.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the February, 1895, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Fr. Heuser, then the editor, contributes the leading article on the last will of a priest, emphasizing that every priest should make such a testament. The article is followed by a detailed exposition of the laws on last wills and testament in the United States. . . . Fr. Maas, S.J., submits a list of books on Scripture that are appropriate for a priest's library. . . . The Latin text of Pope Leo XIII's letter *Longinqua oceani* to the bishops of America is given in full. In this letter the Pontiff expresses his gratification that the Church in America enjoys full civil liberty, but he adds that greater fruits would be produced if the Church enjoyed the support of the laws and the favor of the civil power. . . . A letter of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars to an anonymous bishop (designated as *Amplitudo Tua*) praises him for forbidding the use of velocipedes to his priests, inasmuch as these vehicles endanger bodily safety and are the occasion of drawing down ridicule on priests.

F. J. C.

THE CHURCH OF THE APOSTLES AND THE SECULAR AUTHORITY

In this article an attempt will be made to describe the attitude of the Church of the Apostles towards the secular authority, as evidenced in the Acts of the Apostles and any pagan writings that are immediately relevant. It will be maintained that the character of this attitude will show us something of the peculiar theological tenets of the first Christians, and this without any appeal to specifically religious presuppositions during the examination of the evidence.

The very first incident recorded in the Acts of the Apostles after the gathering of believers at Pentecost, namely, the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, ends in what we may call an encounter with the secular authority. "The priests and the officer of the temple and the Sadducees came upon them" (Peter and John) and arrested them, and had them examined before Annas the high priest and Caiphas who had been high priest (Acts 4). The John and Alexander mentioned in this passage are unknown to us, though the *Codex Beza* has, instead of John, Jonathan, a son of Annas who succeeded Caiphas in 36. But it is sufficiently clear that these represented the most important personages in the Jewish religion.

The motive for the arrest is quite specific: "being grieved that they taught the people, and preached in Jesus the resurrection from the dead" (Acts 4:2). That is to say, it is not the resurrection of Jesus himself from the dead, but the fact that there was any resurrection at all from the dead, which caused them offence. This indicates that they were not in possession of any very accurate information about the teaching of the Apostles (as their constant emphasis at this time is plainly shown in the Acts of the Apostles to have been on the resurrection of Jesus); and also that the move to have them arrested was on the part of the Sadducees, as it was they who denied the resurrection from the dead. The other motive for their arrest is alleged to have been the simple fact that they taught the people. They evidently considered, then, that some affront had been committed against their own authority to teach. Clearly, they regarded the apostles as simply

a Jewish sect. Otherwise indeed they could have exercised no authority over them.

The powers which the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem could exercise over the Jews in that region are referred to by Josephus, quoting a decree of Julius Caesar: "I also ordain that [Hyrcanus the high priest] and his children retain whatsoever privileges belong to the office of high priest, or whatsoever favors have been hitherto granted them; and if at any time hereafter there arise any questions about the Jewish customs, I will that he determine the same."[1] An instance of these previous favors granted is quoted in I Macchabees 15:21, where the Roman consul Lucius writes to king Ptolemy "If therefore any pestilent men are fled out of their country to you, deliver them to Simon the high priest, that he may punish them according to their law." It is clear, therefore, that the right of the high priest to give judicial sentences in accordance with Jewish law, and to carry out police supervision, was recognized by the Roman authority. This clash therefore, as we have suggested, is really a clash with the secular authority.

We find in Acts 4:18 that the Jewish leaders forbid Peter and John to "speak at all, or teach in the name of Jesus." The Greek here elucidates more precisely the meaning of this text: *τὸ καθόλου μὴ φθέγγεσθαι μηδὲ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. In the first place, then, the *καθόλου* appears to qualify both halves of the clause; that is to say, this absolute prohibition included both speaking and teaching. In the second place, *φθέγγεσθαι* has the meaning of any kind of loud utterance; for instance, it is frequently used, derivatively from this meaning, as a metaphor: Xenophon in the *Cyropedia* uses it of thunder; Plato in the *Theaetetus* uses it of an earthen pot (whether it sounds cracked or not). The word is only applicable to utterances such as would be made in public; it cannot refer to private speaking or conversation.

In the third place, the word *ἐπί* is interesting. It is very difficult to see what exact meaning it can have here with the dative case. Two meanings seem possible, both rather awkward in the context. First, it might mean "for," in the sense of "on account of," "on behalf of." Or, second, it might mean "upon," in the sense of "depending upon as a support." Perhaps the very vagueness of the use of this word is intended to indicate that the

[1] *Antiquities of the Jews*, Bk. XIV, c. 10.

Sanhedrin wished the apostles to repudiate any sort of connection with the name of Jesus. Is it making too much of linguistic evidence to suggest that this undefined ἐπί is an epitome of the completeness of the Sanhedrin's prohibition of teaching "in the name of Jesus"?

The universality of this prohibition, then, is sufficiently evident: they are forbidding public preaching in general (φθέγγεσθαι), and any kind of teaching (public or private) in the name of this Jesus. Now in point of fact, owing to the favorable esteem in which Peter and John were at that juncture held by the multitude, they were not able, or did not think it wise, to pass any penal sentence upon them, but merely sent them away with threatenings. Nevertheless, the reply which Peter and John gave to them seems at first sight puzzling in view of the situation as we have outlined it, "If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye" (Acts 4:19). That is to say, although the Sanhedrin is treating them as though they were simply a Jewish sect (and had in fact no rights to treat with them at all on any other ground), Peter and John make no protest against this misunderstanding of the position. It is strange, surely, that instead of defending themselves on the purely religious question that they are not a Jewish sect, they made no attempt to resist whatever punishment the Jewish authority might decide to inflict upon them.

Two elements can be discerned in their attitude which must be carefully distinguished. First of all, there is a recognition of the *de facto* human authority. This recognition is so complete that they do not make any attempt to question whether it is the ultimate human tribunal. Indeed, they go further than this. It is in fact not the correct human tribunal at all. This fact turns upon a most important point in the teaching of this new religion; namely, its separateness from the Jewish religious authority; and yet the apostles resolutely refuse to make any mention of this point. It may indeed be that there was little likelihood of such a plea's being heard, since they were *de facto* Jews, and undifferentiated in the eyes of the world at large from the rest of the Jewish body. It remains true, however, that they were in effect obscuring a main point of their own religion by not pointing to this pregnant distinction between the Jewish religious authority and the Christian religious authority. We are led to search,

then, for some definite reason for such a policy. In the second place, however, they do reject the commands of that Jewish authority; indeed, they appear to set up an opposition between divine and human authority, which they need not set up because they could point out that the case did not really come under the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin at all.

This apparently strange policy is certainly no isolated one. In all the other instances of conflict between the apostles and the secular authority it is carefully adhered to. For instance, in chapter five of the Acts of the Apostles, the "apostles" (mentioned generically this time) are thrown into prison by the same authority. When summoned to appear before the council, they are quoted, in verse 29, as saying: "We ought to obey God rather than men." The Greek word used for "obey" here is significant. It is not the commonest word, but πειθαρχεῖν. This word has a stronger force than the English "obey." It means "to obey the authority of"; and to obey in a rigid and undeviating manner; so that it can for instance be used, metaphorically, of instrumental obedience, as in Cratinus' *Odysseus*, where he says: ὡς ἂν τοῖς πηδαλίοις ἡ ναῦς πειθαρχεῖ. The word shows therefore that they are making a direct appeal to one "authority" against another "authority." Again we are tempted to ask why the opposition should be set up immediately between the local Jewish quasi-religious authority and the divine authority.

The same policy is followed when St. Stephen is condemned to be stoned. His whole speech is an apologia for the new religion as a fulfilment of Jewish prophecies. Yet, faced as he is with the stark refusal of the Jewish leaders to recognize that this fulfilment has now come about, he makes no mention of the claim which essentially flows from his thesis; namely, that the Christian body is, religiously and politically, independent of Jewish rule.

Is it perhaps then that the apostles thought it would be impolitic to make any sort of appeal, direct or indirect, to the Roman authority, as it would seriously diminish their prestige in the eyes of the virulently nationalistic Jewish body as a whole? Such an explanation would seem to be discountenanced by the fact that St. Paul himself, always so keen to insist on his Jewish origins and loyalty, expressly appeals to the fact of his Roman citizenship, once at Lystra after being scourged as mentioned in Acts 16;

again in the presence of Claudius Lysias the tribune when about to be beaten; and finally by appealing to the Roman Emperor against the decision of Festus.

St. Paul's appearance before Felix and Festus demands consideration likewise. Tacitus' description of Felix is "per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem ius regium servili ingenio exercuit."[2] Undoubtedly Tacitus is an historian with an excessive fondness for pithy characterisation, and a marked tendency towards occasional bitterness. Nevertheless, the evidence of other histories bears out this description. Josephus tells us that he had cleared various parts of the country from "robbers" (i.e. the Jewish patriots)[3] and that he had employed assassins to murder the high priest Jonathan, who had been partly responsible for Festus' elevation, but who had presumed to expostulate with the Governor on some of his practices within the sanctuary of the Temple itself.[4] The narrative of the Acts also bears out this view of the baseness of his character—by speaking of him as a voluptuary, by his union with Drusilla whom he had enticed from her husband by means of a magician, and by mentioning also his trembling without repentance at the preaching of St. Paul, and his detention of him in prison from the hope of a bribe. It may be suggested also that when he finally left St. Paul in bonds at Caesarea, this was done from a desire to conciliate those who were about to accuse him at Rome of maladministration. The final breach between him and the Provincials seems to have arisen from a quarrel at Caesarea, between the Jewish and heathen population, which grew so serious that the troops were called out into the streets, and both slaughter and plunder resulted. Felix therefore was replaced by Festus.

Now the relevance of these facts about Felix's character consists in this: that St. Paul's speech before him certainly betrays respect and reverence for his authority. It is not of course so thoroughly cringing in tone as that of the hired orator Tertullus; nevertheless it commences with a recognition (at least implicit) of the long-standing authority of Felix: "Knowing that for many years thou hast been judge over this nation." Further,

[2] *The History*, Bk. V, c. 9.

[3] *Wars of the Jews*, Bk. II, c. 13.

[4] *Antiquities*, Bk. XX, c. 8.

though he preaches to Felix of virtues which the Governor manifestly does not possess, he does not presume to recriminate him in any way.

Combined, however, with this respect for authority, there seems to be a strong desire to force the issue with the state authorities. So much so in fact that the more conscientious Festus, who has already refused to send St. Paul to Jerusalem (as a favor to the Jews, with which to inaugurate his governorship auspiciously), comes in for quite a sharp rebuke: "To the Jews I have done no injury, as thou very well knowest." St. Paul refuses to be heard before the Sanhedrin, even with Festus present or at least under his protection, and insists, however reluctantly, on his right of appeal. Yet, as Agrippa is heard to remark, if he had not appealed, he could have been set free. For Festus would not have been in a postition to punish him for a crime which he had patently not committed. If St. Paul had appealed against trial by a man of Felix's character, it might be more easily understandable.

We are forced to ask then for some explanation of this conduct. To the immoral Felix, St. Paul presents no claim for appeal; but to Festus he does. The fear of how he would be treated by the Jews at or on his way to Jerusalem seems hardly an adequate explanation. Nor was he seeking specially to dissociate himself from the Jews, so that he might the more freely and easily preach to the Gentiles; for at Rome he preached much to the Jews as we read in Acts 28, where "very many" are referred to "and some believed the things that were said, but some believed not." The only adequate explanation seems to be that he was trying to force the issue with the secular authority to the greatest extent that he could.

Now, to summarize the position we have arrived at so far, we have seen that the apostles readily accepted the *de facto* Jewish authority over them. This they did although they might have claimed that it was inapplicable to them. Further, the omission of such a claim (however legitimate in a good cause) tended, we may say, towards obscuring one of the main features of the new religion, namely, its break with the traditional Jewish religious authority. Nevertheless the apostles refused to allow the claims of that authority to dictate to them within their own strictly religious sphere. St. Paul, on the other hand, seems to pursue an

opposite policy. He inquires behind the limited authority of the official before whom he is placed, and appeals to Caesar.

Is any reconciliation of this apparent divergence in policy possible? If we presume that the aim in both cases was to press their position as far as possible with whatever *de facto* authority they happened to meet, so as to illustrate the point of cleavage beyond which the secular authority could no longer be conscientiously recognised by them, then this apparent divergence of policy disappears. For in that case both policies proceed from a desire to show that Christians possessed certain special rights. These rights were underived from the secular authority, and altogether superior to that authority; and they possessed these rights (they were especially, of course, the right of teaching, as concerns the apostles; and the right to refuse certain social ceremonies, as we know from Pliny's letter to Trajan) as a living social organism. In such a case it was immaterial whether the authority was the Jewish authority that had, strictly speaking, no jurisdiction over them, or the highest political authority of Rome; so long as their case was pressed to the point at which their claim to special rights as a social organism could be clearly seen. Unless we accept this explanation specifically, it seems impossible to explain even the few recorded instances of the conflict with the secular authority that we find in the Acts. It would have been a wiser and, humanly speaking, safer course for the apostles to have claimed exemption from the Jewish sentences, and St. Paul not to have appealed to Rome. We suggest that the fact that they did not take these "wiser" courses can only be explained on the hypothesis that they felt compelled to bring into the limelight the rights which the Christians claimed as a body.

If this is so, then, we see the first characteristic of primitive Christianity to have been this consciousness of the body of believers in the new religion as a living permanent organism, not merely side by side with the state, but in some respects at least over and above it: an organism, therefore, which possessed authority within itself. Nothing else seems at all adequate to explain this apparent over-anxiousness to illustrate its point of cleavage with the state authority in circumstances which made it very much safer to preserve silence. It would have been easy, really, for Christianity to have obtained recognition at Rome as

did the other religions, the Jewish included; but we find in the Acts of the Apostles no hint of any such attempt.

At first the Christians were regarded as merely a sect of the Jews, as is made abundantly clear in a fragment from Tacitus' *Histories* quoted by Sulpicius Severus: ". . . quo plenius Iudaeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur: quippe has religiones, licet contrarias sibi, iisdem tamen ab auctoribus profectas, Christianos ex Iudaeis exstitisse: radice sublata stirpem facile perituram."[5] Yet much earlier than the writing of this, and so soon after the writing of the Acts (i.e. in the year 64), the Neronian persecution breaks out. Tacitus says that the Christians were convicted, not so much on the charge of setting fire to Rome, as for "odium humani generis."[6] This provides a striking confirmation of our view deduced from the text of the Acts. Tacitus has obviously no love for the Christian religion: "exitiabilis superstitio" he terms it; yet he does not find himself able to accuse the Christians of any more specific offence than "odium humani generis." He does not think that the Christians caused the fire, and yet he says: "correpti qui fatebantur." It seems unlikely that any of the Christians confessed to incendiarism except under torture; but if we take "correpti" in its normal meaning of "seized, arrested," they would not have been tortured before confessing. What was it then that they confessed? We suggest that, in the context, it can only mean the Christian religion itself. Taking these two hints together, it would seem very probable that they disclose the real reason for the Roman persecution then and subsequently. Rome was tolerant of all religion, especially the Jewish, which had had very many special privileges conceded to it from the time of Julius Caesar onwards, and under the recent Emperors. Why then should the Christians (thought to be a Jewish sect) be singled out? Surely because, and only because, the Roman authority realized in some way this special characteristic of the new sect: that it was essentially a social organism which claimed rights over and above those of any human institution or society—an attitude of universal arrogance which by an unbeliever would most easily be described as "odium humani generis"—disapproval or contempt for human (i.e. non-Chris-

[5] *Chronicorum quae vulgo inscribuntur historia sacra libri duo*, Lib. II, c. 30. (*MPL* 20: 146.)

[6] *The Annals*, Bk. XV, c. 44.

tian) achievements and institutions. We should notice too that the Roman authority knew that this attitude belonged to the essence of the new religion—the simple confession of the Christian faith must bring down the state's condemnation. Fifty years later we find even the humane Trajan insisting on the same principle in his letter to Pliny—he does not want the Christians hunted out, but if any are found and persist in confessing Christ they must be punished.[7]

We suggest in conclusion, then, that the attitude evinced by the Church of the Apostles towards the secular authority as well as the attitude evinced by that authority itself about that period towards the Christians are indicative that a tenet essential to the new religion was that of the socially organic character of the body of believers, involving special rights over and above those of any other institution. This supposition alone explains the anxiety of the early Christians to join issue with the state, and the state's anxiety to join issue with the Christians (if these are facts, as we have endeavored to show). This supposition is especially interesting because, while it vindicates undeniably a strikingly denominational conclusion, it is based upon facts which have not formed a topic of denominational controversy.

NIGEL LARN

St. John's Seminary,
Surrey, England.

[7] Pliny, *The Letters*, Bk. X, n. 98.

AND THEY STILL DO

You [pagans] have preferred to call them [the Christians] enemies of the human race rather than enemies of human error.

—Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 37.

RECENT DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

AN APPROACH TO COMPROMISE

On many occasions in the past nineteen centuries it has happened that when Catholic teachings were subjected to severe attacks from heretics, there were some Catholics who believed that the proper procedure was compromise. They did not, indeed, admit in principle that any genuine Catholic doctrine could be surrendered. But, influenced to some degree by the ideas of the assailants, and fearing that a policy of unqualified intransigence might antagonize these latter still more, they persuaded themselves that the prevailing heresy had something to offer Catholicism—some verity or principle hitherto not fully grasped by Catholics. Hence, they concluded, a slight approach to the enemy's camp, far from being disloyalty to their Church, actually contributed toward the advance of Catholic thought and teaching.

Thus, as a result of the attacks of the Arians, the error known as Semi-Arianism arose in the Church of the fourth century, favored by a number of bishops who believed they were teaching Catholic doctrine. In the fifth century Pelagianism was followed by Semi-Pelagianism, fostered by a group of devout Catholic monks. The Monothelites, in the seventh century, accepted a portion of the Monophysite heresy, hoping thus to bring back to the bosom of the Church some of the adherents of this heresy.[1] In the Middle Ages the view that a general council is above the Pope was a concession to the nationalistic and democratic ideas which were then beginning to thrive in Europe.[2] The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries witnessed the rise of numerous theological systems broached by men who would never dream of leaving the Catholic Church, but who nevertheless were firmly convinced that some compromise with the views of the Reformers was demanded. Such was the origin of the doctrinal aberrations of Baius, Jansenius, and Quesnel. And, only a few decades ago, we beheld the alarming growth of Modernism—a compromise with Rationalism—within the Church until Pope Pius X vigorously tore it up by the roots.

[1] Cf. Hervé, *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Paris, 1935), Vol. II, n. 492.
[2] Cf. Lortz-Kaiser, *History of the Church* (Milwaukee, 1938), p. 272.

At the present time a tendency to compromise appears not infrequently in the writings of Catholics. The error which this attitude favors is latitudinarianism—the spirit so prevalent today of regarding all forms of religion as good and praiseworthy. It would be unjust to direct a general charge of unorthodoxy against the authors of the statements to which we are referring or to pronounce an unqualified condemnation on the statements themselves. The purpose of these writers is undoubtedly to emphasize the fairmindedness and the charity characteristic of the genuine Catholic spirit, and to help those outside the fold to realize that *personal tolerance* toward them is the duty of all Catholics. But, unfortunately, this commendable desire has at times given rise to assertions that are hardly compatible with the *doctrinal intolerance* that is likewise an essential element of the genuine Catholic spirit. This tendency usually shows itself, not in the form of statements definitely opposed to Catholic teaching, but in the form of half-truths, ambiguous expressions, misplaced emphasis, with the result that the average reader is likely to receive a false impression of Catholic belief, even though it might be possible to defend all the statements individually.

Catholics who write on theological topics should be on their guard against this tendency to compromise with the indifferentistic attitude so prevalent in the modern world, which glories in such platitudes as: "Every one has the right to embrace whatever religion appeals to him." We are here presenting under several general headings the forms under which this tendency is likely to show itself. In drawing illustrations from the writings of a limited group of authors, we have no intention of objecting to them in particular. Others write in the same vein, but these few have especially come to our notice.

(1) Statements are sometimes made which imply that incorporation in the visible Church is comparatively unimportant compared to the possession of the state of grace outside the Church. It is asserted that non-Catholics in the friendship of God belong to the "invisible Church" or to the "soul of the Church" or to the "Mystical Body of Christ." For example, E. I. Watkin, in *The Catholic Centre*, describing what he calls "ecclesiastical materialism," says:

> Among Catholics it results in the body of the Church, the visible church, being preferred to the soul of the Church, the invisible com-

munion of Saints. . . . A very common form of ecclesiastical materialism is to value external membership of the Church, sometimes even position in its hierarchy, above the inner union with God established by sanctifying grace. Yet, the former is but a means of the latter, though a means divinely ordained. Even those who genuinely believe that a good Protestant is in better condition than a bad Catholic think that a lukewarm Catholic who does but fulfill the minimum religious observance imposed on him is in a better condition than a devout Protestant.[3]

In a previous essay, *The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ*, the same author asserts:

Theology has been obliged to develop explicitly the distinction between the soul of the Church—the invisible Church-body of all souls who share in the supernatural life—and the body of the Church—the visible Church, Catholic and Roman. . . . About the time of the Greek schism, and again at the dawn of the Reformation, the condition of the Church was as unhealthy as, we hope, it is possible for it to be. Hence the growth of Christian bodies external to the one visible body of Christ, whose individual members are nevertheless incorporated into the mystical body of Christ by their inclusion in the soul of the Church.[4]

In an article in the Anglican periodical *Reunion*, Abbé P. Couturier says: "Let every union among Christian groups succeed, provided only that it be not against some other sect or person."[5]

Now, while it is true, absolutely speaking, that a person in the state of grace outside the Catholic Church is in a better spiritual condition than a member of the Church in the state of mortal sin, comparisons of this kind tend to give the impression that incorporation in the Church is quite unimportant as long as one has the state of grace. How different is this idea from that expressed by Pope Pius XII, referring to non-Catholics, in the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis:*

From a heart overflowing with love We ask each and every one of them to be quick and ready to follow the interior movements of grace, and to look to withdrawing from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. For, even though unsuspectingly they are related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in desire and resolution, they still

---

[3] Watkin, *The Catholic Centre* (London, 1943), pp. 139 f.

[4] *God and the Supernatural*, edited by Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. (London, 1920), p. 263.

[5] *Reunion*, (March, 1938), p. 7.

remain deprived of so many precious gifts and helps from heaven, which one can only enjoy in the Catholic Church.[6]

In other words, instead of telling non-Catholics in the state of grace how much better off they are than sinful Catholics, the Pope tells them how much worse off they are than good Catholics. Only this type of comparison brings out the true Catholic doctrine of the importance of affiliation in the one true Church.

Unfortunate, too, are the statements that those in good faith and in charity outside the Church belong to the Mystical Body, or to the soul of the Church or to the invisible Church.[7] In this connection the words of Pope Pius XII convey a grave message:

> Only those are really to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith and who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults been excluded by legitimate authority. . . . As therefore in the true Christian community there is only one Body, one Spirit, one Lord and one Baptism, so there can be only one faith. . . . It follows that those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in one Body such as this, and cannot be living the life of its one divine Spirit.[8]

Those who are wont to emphasize the importance of membership in the "invisible Church" as compared to membership in the "visible Church" should ponder these words of the Holy Father: "We deplore and condemn the pernicious error of those who conjure up from their fancies an imaginary Church, a kind of society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which they somewhat contemptuously oppose another, which they call juridical."[9]

Mr. Watkin also states that "ecclesiastical materialism" has for its device, not *ad majorem Dei gloriam*, but *ad majorem Ecclesiae gloriam*—in the sense of the visible Church.[10] In the words of Dom Theodore Wesseling, commenting on this passage: "Where is the opposition between the Church and God, between God and his Kingdom, between Christ and the prolongation of

[6] *Mystici Corporis*, NCWC Translation (Washington, 1943), n. 100.

[7] Cf. J. C. Fenton, "Use of Terms Body and Soul," *AER*, CX, 1 (Jan. 1944), 48.

[8] *Mystici Corporis*, NCWC Translation (Washington, 1943), n. 22.

[9] *Ibid.*, n. 64.

[10] *The Catholic Centre* (London, 1943), 141.

Christ in mankind, between the life of God and the deification of man's life?"[11]

(2) The imperfections of Catholics are stressed, particularly those of the hierarchy, not excluding the Pope. The late Eric Gill has this to say in his *Autobiography:* "When you think of St. Peter's and its toy soldiery, and the purple and lace of its fat, worldly-looking prelates, and when you think of the subtle intangibilities and intransigencies of its diplomacy, it is not difficult to understand why people run away in panic."[12] Mr. Watkin is hardly less denunciatory: "Clerics tainted with ecclesiastical materialism sit in virtue of their union with Peter's successor on Peter's seat."[13] And, referring to the sovereignty over the papal states, which the Popes from Pius IX to Pius XI justly claimed as theirs by the law of God, Mr. Watkin remarks: "The maintenance of sovereignty over the entire papal states was, in fact, treated as a spiritual issue and defended by spiritual censures against those who violated it. And this was ecclesiastical materialism, investing what was merely political with a religious value."[14] Relating the mental process preparatory to his entrance into the Church, Mr. Gill says: "The Christ of the Gospel was the Christ of the Church, in spite of all the funny stuff—Vatican paraphernalia, repository art, and heathen superstition masquerading as Christian revelation."[15]

Now, while there always have been and there always will be sinners in the Church, it is unfair to emphasize this fact and to omit the fact that there always have been and always will be many holy persons among both clergy and laity. Certainly, all the Popes of recent times have been men against whose public and private lives no reproach can justly be cast. To enlarge on the evil that is found in Catholics and to make no mention of the good is a half-truth—and a half-truth is sometimes worse than an untruth.

Doubtless, too, the bad example of some Catholics is one of the reasons why there are not more converts to the Church. But to consider the subjective attitude of certain Catholics as the chief

[11] *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, IV, 1 (Jan. 1940), 34.
[12] Eric Gill, *Autobiography* (New York, 1941), 196.
[13] *Op. cit.*, p. 140.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 149.
[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 189.

impediment to the return of non-Catholics to the fold is surely not correct. Yet, Fr. Gerald Vann, O.P., does not hesitate to say: "The refusal to acknowledge that there can be anything to criticize in Catholic society . . . as it is the cause of the hatred of Catholicism, as it is the cause also of secession from the Church . . . so also it is the greatest practical obstacle to the reunion of Christendom."[16]

(3) Sometimes it is stated that visible Christian unity has been destroyed by heresy and schism. For example, Abbé Couturier admits that the "visible mystical Body" has been rent, while claiming that this cannot happen to the "invisible mystical Body."[17] The same writer, after alluding to "divided Christendom," says: "Surrounded by these sad realities, faced with the realisable though transcendent Ideal of visible Christian Unity, the true Christian (whether he is Protestant, Anglican, Orthodox or Catholic matters little), must, of necessity act."[18] Fr. Suso Trepte, O.S.A., seems to regard the return of the Protestant sects to Catholic unity as something to be brought about by mutual concessions, for he quotes approvingly a writer who asserts: "Humanly speaking we can not reckon on a unity brought about by the unconditional submission of other Christian churches to the Roman Church. It can accordingly be a question only of a reunion of the churches, in which both the mother-Church and the daughter each give and receive something."[19]

It is not correct to say that Christianity has lost its unity. The true Church retains this property and note, through the divine assistance. Many have departed from Christian unity, and the only way back is full submission to the teaching and government of the Catholic Church. It is misleading to compare world Christianity with "a building in construction, which one day is to possess two hundred pews, but at present can count only thirty."[20] This seems to imply that the Church is not yet fully established. The proper comparison is that of a building, com-

[16] Vann, O. P., *Morals Makyth Man* (London, 1938), p. 135.

[17] *Reunion* (March, 1938), p. 15.

[18] *Reunion* (Dec. 1937), p. 457.

[19] *Reunion* (June, 1938), p. 37.

[20] *Education to World Christianity* (Washington, 1944), p. 17.

pleted and containing two hundred pews, of which only thirty are occupied.

(4) Finally, the word "Christianity" is sometimes used in such wise as to give a false impression. Thus, it is sometimes stated that "Christianity is the only influence that will save the world." This is quite true if by "Christianity" is meant Catholicism, the only religion that is Christianity in the proper sense; but it certainly is not true if applied to the meagre elements of the Christian revelation that are held in common by all the Protestant sects. It is well to note that rarely, if ever, is the term "Christians" used in pronouncements of the Holy See with reference to non-Catholics. The present Holy Father has, indeed, made many appeals to those outside the Church to collaborate in opposing the evils that oppress the world, but he refers to such persons as "men of good will" or even "those who are near to us in their faith in God and in Jesus Christ," rather than as "Christians." Pope Pius XI made the blunt statement: "They, therefore, who profess themselves Christians cannot, we think, but believe in Christ's establishment of one Church and only one."[21]

Brief though it is, this summary of some of the expressions and statements found today in certain writings of Catholics should show that there is a tendency toward religious indifferentism in these expositions of Catholic teaching. The result is that some Catholics, not familiar with the fine points of theology, are in danger of being misled as to the attitude of the Church toward religious denominations outside her own pale. And there is grave danger that non-Catholics, sincerely anxious for reunion with the Catholic Church, may receive the impression that they can attain this goal by a bilateral compromise with Catholicism, by giving up a little of their present belief and worship while the Catholic Church renounces some of her beliefs. Or, they will complacently decide that they are quite safe in their present position, as members of the "invisible Church" according to sound Catholic belief.

This is most unfortunate. The Church contends today, as it always has, that incorporation in its visible body is the sole ordinary means of salvation. The Church claims the exclusive right to teach officially Christian doctrine and to exercise public religious cult. The Church has never lost its essential unity of

[21] *Mortalium Animos*, NCWC Translation (Washington, 1928), n. 5.

faith, worship, and government, despite the defection of many from that unity. There have always been sinful Catholics, but despite that fact, the Church herself remains the Spouse of Christ, by whose death she has been sanctified, having neither spot nor wrinkle, but holy and without blemish.[22]

Today, when expediency rather than principle is the chief norm of conduct for so many, Catholics must be on their guard lest they yield to the spirit of compromise with false liberalism, even though it be only in the use of ambiguous terms. They must not permit a feeling of sympathy for those outside the Church or a fear that they will draw down on themselves hatred and ridicule because of their intransigence to induce them to make statements not fully consonant with the Church's firm and unalterable stand. No compromise is possible when divine truth is at stake. There are few things that are unchangeable in the modern world, but one of them is the claim of the Catholic Church to be the sole authoritative exponent and interpreter of God's message to mankind.

THE ENDS OF MARRIAGE

For more than a decade a view concerning the ends of marriage has been defended by some Catholics, different from the Church's traditional teaching. According to this latter doctrine, the primary end of the married state is the procreation and the proper bringing-up of children; the secondary ends are the mutual love and assistance which marriage brings to the couple, and also (in the present state of fallen nature) the providing of a remedy against concupiscence. According to the new theory, the primary end of marriage is the perfecting of the personality of each of the two by union with the other. The best known exponent of this view has been Dr. Hubert Doms, in his work *Vom Sinn und Zweck der Ehe*, translated into English under the title *The Meaning of Marriage*.[23] He expresses his opinion thus:

> The constitution of marriage, the union of two persons, does not then consist in their subservience to a purpose outside themselves, *for* which they marry. It consists in the vital ordination of husband and wife to

---

[22] Cf. *Ephes.* 5:25.

[23] Cf. *AER*, LXXXII, 2 (Aug. 1935), 196.

each other until they become one. If this is so, there can no longer be sufficient reason, from this standpoint, for speaking of procreation as the primary purpose (in the sense in which St. Thomas used the phrase) and for dividing off the other purposes as secondary. But the child is a powerful means by which husband and wife may perfect each other supernaturally. From *this* point of view we can say (and the Encyclical *Casti connubii* will support us) that the principal and primary purpose of marriage is not the child, but the mutual forming and perfecting of husband and wife in the metaphysical, natural and, above all, supernatural orders.[24]

A very explicit decision of the Holy Office on this subject was issued on April 1, 1944. After explaining that views have recently been broached according to which the primary end of marriage is the perfecting of each through a community of life and action, or the mutual love and union fostered and perfected by the self-surrender of each to the other, the decree goes on to state that we cannot admit the view of certain recent writers who either deny that the primary end of marriage is the procreation and rearing of offspring, or teach that the secondary ends are not essentially subordinate to the primary end but are equally important and independent.[25] It is interesting to note in this connection that in a decision of the Rota, delivered several weeks before the decree of the Holy Office, the traditional doctrine of the ends of marriage was expounded at length, and the view of the "recent authors" was rejected as devoid of sound arguments.[26]

The attitude of the Church toward this question, about which so much has been written in the past ten years, is clear and definite. No Catholic may hereafter deny that the primary end of marriage is the procreation and the rearing of children. In other words, marriage is primarily a social rather than a personalistic institution. On this principle are based the most important ethical teachings of the Catholic Church concerning the conjugal state, particularly the sinfulness of contraception and divorce.

THE CHURCH AND SCIENCE

Some interesting papers on the relation between Catholic faith and the natural sciences have recently appeared in *The*

[24] Doms, *The Meaning of Marriage* (New York, 1939), p. 87.
[25] *AAS*, XXXVI (1944), 103.
[26] *AAS*, XXXVI (1944), 185 ff.

Month. In the March-April issue, F. Sherwood Taylor summarizes the relations between the Catholic Church and science down through the centuries. While upholding the principle that there can be no real contradiction between revelation and the findings of science, he calls for a greater willingness on the part of some Catholics to consider scientific evidence objectively as well as the sense of divine revelation, and thus to establish a working hypothesis on which they can be harmonized. He adds that if Catholics from the seventeenth century had encouraged, financed and promoted science, as was done for philosophy in the Middle Ages, science might be glorifying God today instead of belittling man.

The same issue contains a paper by E. T. Whittaker on "The New Physics and the Philosophy of Catholics." Unfortunately, Dr. Whittaker, though he doubtless is an excellent mathematician, manifests grave limitations in his concepts of metaphysics. In the July-August number, Dom Aelred Whitacre replies to Dr. Whittaker. Thus, the latter had stated that the principle of causality can no longer be regarded as universally valid, and cites as a proof the fact that the break-up of a radium atom is entirely unpredictable, lacking any factor of determined time. Dom Whitacre points out the fallacy of this argument—the identification of unpredictability, a subjective element, with causelessness, an objective element, and adds: "No metaphysician, in his search after objective truth, has ever intermingled a subjective element with objective truth as essential to its notion."

MARIOLOGY

It is commonly assumed that Our Lady was aware of the divinity of her Son from the time of the annunciation. A different view is proposed by Fr. Edmund Sutcliffe, S.J., in *The Month* for September-October. He believes that this knowledge came to Mary only gradually. This view was proposed by Venerable Bede, and was implied by St. Bonaventure, in commenting on the scriptural statement following the narrative of the loss and finding in the Temple, "they (Mary and Joseph) understood not the word He spoke unto them." Fr. Sutcliffe points out that the message of the angel of the annunciation mentioned Christ's messiahship, but not His divinity. He thinks, too, that the "adora-

tion" of the Magi is to be understood of homage, without perception of the divine personality of the Babe. His own view is that Mary had come to the knowledge of her Son's divinity by the time of His separation from her at the beginning of His public ministry.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

"HARSH TO NONE AND GENEROUS TO ALL"

It is evident that there must be a limit to liberality, otherwise generosity will become useless. Moderation must be observed especially by priests who should dispense their charities, not in ostentatious fashion, but with due regard to justice. The greed of beggars has never been greater than today. Strong men come to you and their one plea is "I am on the road." And yet they would clear out your poorbox and leave it without a penny. They are not satisfied with a little, they always ask for more. Their claim to be assisted is backed up by a great display of rags, and with invented tales of coming birthdays they bid for an increase in their dole. If anyone trusts them too readily he will soon exhaust the funds that are meant for the support of the poor. Let there be a system in our generosity so that while these vagrants do not go away quite empty, the subsistence of the poor may not be wasted and made a prize for cheats. Let us make such an apportionment as will neither forget the claims of humanity nor leave necessity stranded.

Many people pretend they have debts. Look into the real facts. Many complain that they have been stripped by the robbers. Help them generously, but only when their distress is manifest and you are acquainted with them personally. To those who have been cut off from church communion, supplies must be granted if they are in actual want of food. The man who works according to a system is harsh to none and generous to all. We ought to lend our ears to hear the cries of the petitioners but we also ought to use our eyes to look into their needs.

— St. Ambrose, *De Officiis Ministrorum*, II, 15.

APOLOGETICS AND PREACHING

A recent and brilliantly written article, "*L'apologétique de la chaire doit-elle être une chaire d'apologétique?*"[1] written by the distinquished young Canadian scholar, the Rev. Dr. Gerard Yelle, S.S., tends to discourage sermons presenting the matter of scientific apologetics to the Catholic people. This article is significant, not merely because it is written with all the authoritative competence which we have come to expect from Dr. Yelle, but also because it brings into the open an attitude which has been adopted by a great many priests in this country and in Canada. There is an easily discernible tendency among many of our priests to look upon the matter of apologetics as in some way either too abstruse or too impractical to be of great service to the people in these difficult times. Dr. Yelle is to be commended for placing the issue squarely before those who are most interested in it.

According to Dr. Yelle, apologetics is in some measure disqualified as a subject for ordinary sermons principally because of the difficulties attendant upon a proper exposition of this science and because of the defensive attitude inherent in it. He urges preachers to restrict themselves to the four headings under which, according to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, our elders gathered together all the force and the science of salvific doctrine. These four headings are the Apostles' Creed, the Sacraments, the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer. Dr. Yelle notes that there is no mention of apologetics. This observation is perfectly true. Nevertheless it would be well not to forget that the Preface to the great catechism, to which Dr. Yelle appeals, begins with two chapters on the weakness of the light of nature and on the necessity of supernatural revelation and ends with two more on the nature of faith and the reason for the Creed. It is somewhat unusual to use a document with such a Preface as an argument against the preaching of apologetics.

Furthermore, there would seem to be ample scriptural warrant for making the matter of apologetics an ordinary subject of pulpit instruction. The Prince of the Apostles issued the command to "sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts, being ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which

[1] *Le séminaire*, VIII (1943), 183 ff.

is in you."[2] There is no reason whatsoever to suppose that St. Peter wanted that order obeyed only by priests or only by the more intellectual and erudite among the brethren. He spoke of a duty incumbent upon all of our Lord's disciples, and it is a duty which they can perform only if they receive adequate instruction from their pastors. It would be difficult in the extreme to find a manner in which the pastors could present this information to their people without using the matter of apologetics in preaching.

THE DIFFICULTY OF APOLOGETICS

Dr. Yelle quite properly insists upon the difficulty inherent in the science of apologetics, and seems to think that, because of this difficulty, the matter as a whole is beyond the capabilities of the average Catholic congregation. He believes that our people would be confused rather than instructed if they were to be informed that, for the purposes of apologetics, we consider the inspired books only as historical documents. He implies that misunderstanding will very likely be generated by the information that the term "Son of God" in the Gospels frequently means only "Messias."

To a certain extent he is right. The man who would presume to incorporate into his sermon some technical point in apologetics, clothed in technical language, would certainly find that he had either befuddled most of his congregation or that he had mercifully put them to sleep. Still, there is no reason for restricting this very manifest situation to the field of apologetics. A man would, to put it mildly, do very little to nourish the flame of faith in the minds of his hearers if, on the occasion of a sermon on the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, he were to regale them with St. Thomas' teaching on the four real relations and the five notions. The laity in the average parish would derive small spiritual refreshment from a sermon devoted to Father Noldin's excellent arguments against probabiliorism. A preacher would find some difficulty in keeping the attention of his flock while he was expounding the sane Thomistic doctrine that the sacramental character is to be placed in the second rather than in the first sub-species of quality. Yet, despite these difficulties, there

[2] *I Pet.* 3:15.

is no ascertainable effort to rule the matter of dogmatic, moral, or sacramental theology out of the subjects for preaching.

The sort of difficulty to which Dr. Yelle alludes is chargeable to pedantry and to insufficient theological knowledge rather than to the matter of scientific apologetics. The pedant who tries to ornament his sermons with literal translations from Tanquerey or Pesch will make a prodigious mess of any subject he handles. The man who has a sort of parrot-knowledge of Christian doctrine will usually, if he makes a serious incursus into the field of theology, find his discourse laden with a suspiciously large number of anglicized Latin technical terms. The priest who knows his subject and who knows his people will find no great difficulty in bringing them to know the theological truths of which they stand in need. He will be able to do this in any part of theology he is called upon to use.

The Catholic laity would certainly encounter the kind of difficulty described by Dr. Yelle if they were subjected to the type of sermon commonly produced by seminarians for use in their classes of homiletics. A good many years ago a healthy majority of such sermons proved to be appallingly faithful renderings of the primitive editions of Tanquerey then in use. The same affection for the letter of the text is manifest in the seminarians of 1945. Now, as then, the professor of homiletics must essay patiently (and professors of homiletics are almost invariably the most patient men on theological faculties), to inform the budding Lacordaires and Spaldings that such discourses are of questionable value. Those who harken to the words of their professors of homiletics will never trouble their congregations with the difficulties decried by Dr. Yelle.

Incidentally, the present-day crop of laymen encounters remarkably little trouble from an overabundance of difficult technical theological terminology emanating from the pulpit. The disease of modern preaching comes rather as the result of an orgy of analogy. The Church of Jesus Christ, and every other reality described in divine public revelation, appear in much modern writing and preaching under dazzling and confusing swarms of metaphors. Fortunately the strain put upon these figures of speech is seldom as intense as that found in the sermon depicting "the mystical body of Christ" as "a spring of fresh water in the desert of the world." But even where the rules of

prose composition remain inviolate, the very brilliance of the similes and the metaphors in modern sermons tends to hide the realities which these figures are meant to indicate.

Characteristically a generation of preachers which has specialized in metaphor has concentrated its attention on a metaphorical name for the Catholic Church itself. Contemporary sermons and writings have so insisted upon the metaphorical designation of the Church as the mystical body of Christ that there is some danger of the Catholic public's forgetting the fact that, in the Acts of the Apostles for example, definite and highly non-metaphorical appellations are given to the Church and to its members. It is certainly well for the Catholics to understand that St. Paul has referred to the Church as the body of Christ. It is still more important that they should know the facts about the Church which the Apostle of the Gentiles expressed when he employed this metaphor. But, limiting ourselves to the most common designation of our Lord's society, we should not allow our people to overlook the fact that the word "*ecclesia*" has a meaning and is definitely not a metaphor. Those who hear our sermons would profit by knowing that, while Catholics are rightly described as members of Christ, they are also properly called His disciples and His brethren.

APOLOGETICS AND DEFENCE

A more serious charge against the fitness of apologetics as a subject for preaching is the assertion that it is essentially a defensive discipline. The concept of a defensive doctrine which warrants such a charge is one which comes from the unfortunate "state of siege" theory. According to this notion, apologetics is devoted to the task of turning back the assaults of the enemies of the Church. It seeks primarily to shield Catholic truth against the weapons of its foes. It does not contribute anything to the understanding of the doctrine itself. Obviously, if the science of apologetics, as it actually exists, were such a defensive discipline, it would have no place whatsoever in the subject matter for parochial preaching.

Two of the theological manuals most widely used by our American seminarians tend to encourage this attitude towards apologetics. Both Tanquerey and Hervé dismiss the first portion

of the treatise *De Ecclesia* as "apologetics" and treat of the supernatural character of the Church in the second section. Both exclude the mystical body teaching from their "apologetics." Under the heading of "apologetics," however, both include the teaching on the institution of the Church, its nature as a monarchical and hierarchical society, and its notes.[3]

From such an arrangement it is easy to draw the wholly unwarranted inference that the matters labeled as "apologetics" have primarily and almost exclusively a polemic import, while the theses associated with the explanation of the mystical body doctrine contain the supernatural intellectual nourishment needed by our people. Tanquerey speaks of this second portion of the *De Ecclesia* as dealing with the "intimate" constitution of the Church while Hervé describes it as concerned with the "more intimate" constitution. At any rate both authors seem convinced that the portion of doctrine classified as apologetics contains truths which are visible to those who have faith and those who lack it, while the "properly theological teaching" contains truths which only the person who has the faith can appreciate.

Such an attitude can very well engender a sad confusion among students of theology. The man who thinks that the theses on, for instance, the establishment of the Church by our Lord, the presentation of His teaching as divine public revelation, and the supernatural character of Catholic dogma are in some way to be withheld from the ordinary Sunday congregation because they smack of controversy will find himself depriving his people of the very truths which they need most urgently. Ironically enough, the teaching on the strength of which the people would be refused such instruction is quite devoid of any objective foundation.

First of all we must understand that Catholic theology recognizes no valid defence of a dogma which does not involve an explanation of the teaching in question. Hence the portion of Catholic theology designated as apologetics is not only a defence of basic Christian truth, but, at the same time, a clear and necessary explanation of the fundamental teachings in question. When, for instance, we start out to defend the claims of Catholic

[3] Cf. Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae Fundamentalis*, 24th ed. (Paris, 1937), pp. 388 ff.; Hervé, *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae*, 19th ed. (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1943), I, 274 ff.

dogma as supernatural revelation, we have to begin with an explanation of what we mean by the term "supernatural," as it appears in this context. We have to show what the Church means when it describes its own teaching as a divine revelation. If we set out to offer historical evidence that our Lord really established a visible religious society during the course of His public life in this world, we have to bring forth evidence which shows the type of organization our Lord wished His society to be. All of this doctrine is absolutely necessary for any man who intends to do his duty and to give the reason for the hope that is in him. All of it is truth without which neither the Catholic Church nor the dogma taught by that Church can ever be appreciated.

Actually a good portion of our theological literature bears evidence of this modern Catholic distaste for what is regarded as apologetics. In many instances those theses which deal with matter presumed to be controversial are passed over somewhat hurriedly, while a greater devotion is lavished on those theses which are presumed to have a more direct bearing on the spiritual life of Catholics. This is particularly noticeable in the case of the thesis on our Lord's establishment of the Church. Actually the truth presented in this brings out facts about our Lord's Church just as profound and just as beautiful as any which are inculcated in other portions of ecclesiology. No one can construct a valid proof of the fact that our Lord really instituted the Church without indicating that this Church is really the society of His disciples, the group originally composed of those who accompanied our Lord on His journeys during the days of His public life. No one can grasp such a proof without a comprehension of our Lord's presence in the Church which could never come from an examination of any metaphor.

If we really understand the "apologetic" proof that our Lord founded the Church we must make use of St. Peter's first recorded order to the flock which Christ entrusted to his care. The prince of the apostles commanded his followers to select some one of their number as a replacement for the fallen traitor Judas in the apostolic college.

Wherefore of these men who have companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out among us,

Beginning from the baptism of John, until the day wherein he was

taken up from us, one of these must be made a witness with us of his resurrection.[4]

In this text, which must be used for any valid proof that our Lord established the Church, we find that the society which lived at Jerusalem after the ascension, the society which is the Catholic Church, is the very society within which our Lord walked and moved during the days of His public life on earth. It is the society of the disciples, so designated in the Acts of the Apostles, and so recognizable in the gospel teachings. The people whom our Lord organized into a perfect society, containing at the same time both rulers and subjects, were the very persons whom He invited to be His pupils or disciples.

Only the person who sees the full import of the thesis on our Lord's establishment of the Church is in a position to realize what He meant and what the apostles and the other disciples understood Him to mean when He promised: "And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."[5] We could never appreciate the significance of these words unless we knew that they were addressed to a society in the midst of which He had come in and gone out during all the time of His public life. And, we would not be in a position to recognize this characteristic of the Church unless we were aware of the "apologetic" teaching about its foundation by our Lord. It would be tragic if our people were to be deprived of this teaching merely because of some false theory about the defensive character of scientific apologetics.

As a matter of fact some of our contemporary literature and preaching shows the effects of an insufficient preoccupation with the matter of fundamental theology. Perhaps the most serious confusion prevalent in this country today concerns the interrelations of the natural and the supernatural. It is true that the modern manuals explain some of this teaching in the treatise *De Gratia*, but it is also true that the fundamental distinctions, teachings with which our people should certainly be familiar, fall under the heading of apologetics. The dangers of practical indifferentism too can only be met by teachings set forth scientifically in fundamental dogmatic theology.

[4] *Acts* 1:21–22.

[5] *Matt.* 28:20.

No, that portion of Catholic teaching which is set forth in scientific form in scholastic apologetics will not be useless to the disciples of Christ because of any imperfection or limitation in the doctrine itself. They can, however, be ineffectively preached and explained, but then the fault lies with the teacher rather than with the matter under discussion. Like every other portion of our Lord's doctrine, the teaching of apologetics must be set forth accurately and adequately if it is to be of any service to the flock of Christ. And it is very easy to present an inaccurate rendering of the truths of Catholic apologetics.

The matter of apologetics is not of much use to our people unless it is accurately demonstrated. Far too frequently, however, the "proofs" which are presented in sermons are anything but valid. All too often intelligent Catholic laymen are presented with a proof of the fact that the Catholic Church was established by Christ, which, *mutatis mutandis*, would never convince anyone that the Soviet Union had been founded by Nicolai Lenin, or that the Knights of Columbus had been instituted by Monsignor McGivney. An insufficient or an inadequate proof is, of course, far worse than no demonstration at all. It can only succeed in bringing people to think that the evidence in possession of the Catholic Church is, after all, of no great probative value. To this extent, then, Dr. Yelle is perfectly correct. If a man is not willing to exert himself to prove the points which he claims to prove, it would be well for him to avoid the matter of apologetics altogether in his sermons. The Church of Jesus Christ has far more to fear from an inaccurate presentation of its own message by Catholics than from any attack which it can sustain from the outside.

THE PRACTICALITY OF APOLOGETICS IN PREACHING

Those who object to the inclusion of apologetics in sermon material frequently appeal to our Lord's "use of simple images rather than of scientific matter" in His discourses. Unfortunately such persons fail to advert to the fact that, while our Lord spoke to the multitudes in parables, He deigned to offer His disciples a definite and non-metaphorical explanation of the truths presented in the parables.

And his disciples asked him what this parable might be.

To whom he said: To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but to the rest in parables, that seeing they may not see and hearing may not understand.[6]

We must not allow ourselves to forget that the sermons which we preach in our Churches are addressed, not to the multitudes, but to the disciples themselves. The persons who hear the instructions contained in our sermons are not those whom our Lord taught in parables. They are not persons whom we are expected to nourish on a diet of metaphor, however colorful and "literary" that metaphor may be. The people of Christ need, and are entitled to, the sort of instruction which will give them a sufficient grasp of divinely revealed truth. That instruction, given in the form of preaching, must include the elements of apologetics.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[6] *Luke* 8:9–10.

HUMILITY OF THOSE IN AUTHORITY

One who is placed above others in command must so conduct himself in ruling his subjects that he will be distinguished, not only by authority but also by humility. However, the virtue of humility in him will be such that the lives of his subjects shall not be corrupted by vices; and his authority will be such that there will not be immoderate harshness and severity. This is true discretion in the priests of God, by which they are neither proud through their independence nor lax through their humility. For this reason the saints with great constancy condemned the vices even of princes. For, although in these saints there was supreme humility, nevertheless when it was necessary they chided without hesitation the transgressors of justice. Sometimes we must humble ourselves in soul even to our subjects, since the deeds of our subjects are judged by us, but our deeds are judged by God. Let the bishop recognize himself as the servant of the people, not their master; this, however, is demanded by charity, not by his condition.

—St. Isidore of Seville, *Sententiarum Lib. III*, cap. 42.

Answers to Questions

THE MORALITY OF UNIVERSAL CONSCRIPTION

Question: What is to be said of the morality of universal military conscription, particularly in peace time? There is a project now being promoted to oblige all our young men to serve at least a year in the army or navy even after the war is ended.

Answer: According to Catholic theological principles, a nation engaged in a just war may oblige its citizens to take part in the fighting, in so far as is necessary for the winning of the war. Even when the nation is not actually engaged in warfare, military service may be imposed on all the men if there is a proximate danger of attack from some other nation. In the words of Lehmkuhl: "Conscription is just, in general, if there is a necessity of a just war and necessary preparation for it" (*Theologia Moralis*, [Friburg, 1898], n. 986).

However, apart from real necessity, the system of military conscription, even though the obligatory service is demanded only for a year, is to be reprobated. It makes a great demand on the finances of a people; it tends to render the youth war-minded; it takes young men away from the salutary influence of the home at a critical period of their lives and exposes them to many moral dangers; it puts them in a situation in which they can easily be impregnated with false ethical and political theories. The dire effects of the Nazi policy of military service among the youth of Germany, especially their fanatical loyalty to materialistic and totalitarian ideals, should be a grave reminder of what is likely to happen in any country that adopts compulsory military training as one of its normal policies.

According to Noldin, two conditions are required in order to justify compulsory military service: (1) No greater number of soldiers shall be drafted than is necessary to assure the safety of the country; otherwise, the resources of the nation are wasted, and the men are exposed to the moral dangers of army life without necessity; (2) Men shall not be drafted when there is a sufficient number of volunteers to supply the needs of the country (*Summa Theologiae Moralis*, [Innsbruck, 1938], II, 318).

It would be tragic if universal conscription were introduced into the United States without real necessity. It would be a grave infringement on our personal liberty, which is supposed to be the very foundation of our national life. Catholics would justly regard it as a rejection of the Pope's peace plan, which includes gradual disarmament of nations as a necessary means toward lasting peace. Nor can it be reasonably objected that Catholics need not accept political guidance from the Pope, for beyond doubt the Holy Father was merely interpreting the natural law when he drew up his program for peace. At any rate, immediate legislation making military conscription a permanent feature of our American life should be vigorously opposed, for a decision of this nature cannot reasonably be made in the hectic times of war. At their recent annual meeting the bishops of the United States protested against any immediate legislative measure of this nature.

THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

Question: Is the eucharistic fast broken if a person puts a "poloris plaster" on an aching tooth and keeps it there all night?

Answer: According to the norms commonly laid down by theologians for the observance of the eucharistic fast, it would seem that the fast is not broken in the case presented by the questioner. A "poloris plaster" contains a small quantity of medicinal substance which is gradually dissolved and seeps through into the gums to relieve the pain. It is to be expected that a minute amount of this solution will be swallowed. However, since the purpose of the plaster is medication, not nutrition, and since the quantity of the solution released into the mouth is very small and is immediately mingled with the saliva, it may be considered as taken *per modum salivae*, and thus the eucharistic fast is not broken.

ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION

Question: The practice of artificial insemination, whereby a married woman, who cannot be fecundated by her husband, becomes a mother through seed donated by another man, is becoming quite common. The seed is transferred to her body without

any sexual union—without even necessity of her seeing the donor or knowing who he is. Although our sense of decency tells us this is wrong, it is not easy to designate precisely the nature of the sin thus committed. People are arguing today that no adultery takes place, since the woman's husband consents, and no act of impurity is committed, since there are no sexual relations between the woman and the donor. What is the teaching of Catholic theology relative to this problem?

Answer: According to the teachings of Catholic theology, it is a principle of the natural law that a woman has no right to receive into her vagina the seed of any man except her husband. For, the welfare of society demands that children be born only of a couple united by marriage, since only in this supposition can offspring be properly reared. Any violation of this principle is *per se* gravely harmful to society, and consequently a mortal sin against legal justice. Hence, a single woman who would have a child by the method of artifical insemination would sin in this manner. A married woman would also violate commutative justice, by infringing on the exclusive right of her husband to fecundate her; and from this standpoint her act would contain the specific element of adultery. The fact that her husband has given consent would not essentially alter the case, since there is question of a right which he cannot renounce.

All this would be true even in the (improbable) supposition that the seed is procured by the aid of a needle directly from the testicles of the donor, without any sexual activity. Ordinarily the donor procures the seed by masturbation, and this would add the guilt of impurity to the procedure.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

SHOULD FOLDED CHASUBLES HAVE BEEN WORN ON CHRISTMAS EVE?

Question: Last year (1944) the Vigil of Christmas coincided with the Fourth Sunday of Advent. The Ordo directs that the precedence be given to the Vigil. At Solemn Mass on this Sunday, should the deacon and subdeacon have worn folded chasubles or dalmatics?

Answer: The Vigil of Christmas ranks with the Vigil of Pentecost as a privileged vigil of the first class, which does not yield precedence to any feast of whatever grade. A special rubric, found in the Missal after the Mass for the Fourth Sunday of Advent, provides that when the Eve of Christmas falls on this Sunday, the Mass is to be of the Vigil with a commemoration of the Sunday, not, however, including the Gospel of the latter as a proper Last Gospel.

Folded chasubles are to be worn at Solemn Mass on days of fasting and penance and on the Sundays of Advent and Lent, except *Gaudete* and *Laetare* Sundays. Ordinarily, therefore, the Fourth Sunday of Advent would be a day for the wearing of the folded chasubles. The Vigil of Christmas, however, is expressly excluded by the rubrics of the Missal (*Rubricae Generales Missalis*, XIX, 6) from the days which carry the obligation of the folded chasubles. *In casu*, when the Fourth Sunday of Advent is also the Eve of Christmas, since the Mass is of the latter, we conclude that dalmatics, and not folded chasubles, are the proper vestments for the deacon and subdeacon.

WASHING THE SACRED LINENS

Question: We were taught in the Seminary that the sacred linens were to be washed three times before being sent to the laundry. I am told that now only one washing is required by a cleric in sacred orders. Have the other two washings been suppressed or should they be done by a nun or sacristan, before the linens are laundered?

Answer: The legislation of the *Codex Juris* (Canon 1306) simply prescribes that the sacred linens be washed by a cleric in major orders before being laundered by others. There is no reference to more than one washing. The Canon in question reads as follows: "Purificatoria, pallae, et corporalia, in Missae sacrificio, adhibita, ne tradantur lavanda laicis, etiam religiosis, nisi prius abluta fuerint a clerico in majoribus ordinibus constituto."

CARRYING THE CHALICE VEIL TO THE GOSPEL SIDE

Question: Is it correct for the altar boy to carry the chalice veil over to the Gospel side, after the ablutions, and leave it on

the altar table or hold it for the convenience of the priest in covering the chalice before the Communion verse?

Answer: The *Ritus Servandus in Celebratione Missae* says nothing about carrying the chalice veil over to the Gospel side, after the ablution. It does mention transferring the Missal to the Epistle side. At Solemn Mass, it is proper for one of the acolytes to carry the chalice veil to the left side of the altar table for the convenience of the subdeacon in making up the chalice. We see no reason to extend this practice to Low Mass, where it is at least as easy for the priest to handle the veil from the right side as from the left. Since the matter is one *praeter rubricas*, and not contrary to them, it may be left to custom, though personally we see no practical advantage in carrying the veil over.

WASHING THE HANDS AFTER MASS

Question: Many sacristies are equipped with two wash-stands, one marked *Ante Missam* and the other *Post Missam*. The latter usually connects with the sacrarium. Is it proper to use the sacrarium for this purpose or is there any obligation to do so?

Answer: The readiest answer to the above question is that there is no prescription of the rubrics requiring any washing of the hands after taking off the vestments at the conclusion of Mass. The *Ritus Servandus in Celebratione Missae* (XII, 6) is silent as to any washing of the hands after unvesting. Even Bishops, for whom numerous lotions of the hands are prescribed, are not directed by the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* to wash the hands after Mass, whether it be a Low Mass or a Pontifical one. Some liturgists (v.g. Wapelhorst, 123, 2) *permit* the after-Mass hand cleansing, if such be the custom. In no case, however, is there any obligation to wash the hands.

In view of what has just been said, we cannot see much reason for *two* wash-stands, one to be used before Mass and the other after Mass, nor for the latter to connect with the sacrarium. Any particles of the Sacred Species which might adhere to the fingers would have probably been lost with all the handling of the chalice and its appurtenances, the Missal, the biretta, and the vestments before the priest has come to wash his hands a final time after unvesting.

MUST THE OSTENSORIUM BE BLESSED?

Question: Is it of obligation to bless the ostensorium before it is used for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament? If so, is any special blessing to be used or merely the one common for all vessels destined to contain the Sacred Species?

Answer: While there is a clear prescription requiring the consecration of the chalice and paten before they are used at Mass (*Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae*, I, 1), the necessity for blessing other sacred vessels before use is not so exactly defined. Authors generally, v.g. Wapelhorst (*Com. S. Lit.* 25, 5) distinguish between vessels which come directly in contact with the Sacred Species, like the lunette, the ciborium, and the pyx for the Communion of the sick, for which they require blessing, and others where the contact is only mediate, like the ostensorium and the case for the lunette, which *may* be blessed though the blessing is not *de rigueur*. Basing our answer on these authorities, the ostensorium may be blessed and it is quite praiseworthy but not obligatory to bless it before use.

As to the form to be used, the *Benedictio Tabernaculi seu Vasculi pro sacrosancta Eucharistia conservanda*, found in the Ritual (Tit. VIII, Cap. 23) is proper both for the tabernacle itself and any vessel destined to house the Sacred Species, like the ciborium or the lunette, comprehending also the ostensorium. There is, however, a special blessing, *Benedictio Tabernaculi seu Ostensorii pro Sanctissimo Sacramento fidelium venerationi exponendo*, number 3 among the *Benedictiones Reservatae*, in the Appendix of the Ritual, which because of its special *à propos* seems preferable to the general form, mentioned above, when the blessing is of an ostensorium.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

THE HEAVENLY MERCHANT

For He had come into this world as a rich and merciful merchant from the heavens, and by a marvellous exchange entered upon a saving transaction receiving what was ours and imparting what was His, giving honor for insults, salvation for sorrow, and life for death.

—St. Leo the Great, Sermon 54, 4.

ANALECTA

Number 7 of Volume XXXVI of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* reports two Apostolic Constitutions, an Apostolic Letter, an Apostolic Allocution, a reply of the Holy Office, a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Religious, three decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites concerning processes of canonization and one of the same Sacred Congregation regarding the Apostolic Blessing conferred by Cardinals, and a decree of the Sacred Penitentiary regarding an indulgenced ejaculation. Besides these documents one finds also a list of dignities issued by the Secretariate of State, a record of the meetings of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and a list of appointments to bishoprics issued by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation. In the latter list under date of June 15, 1944, there is recorded the appointment of Most Rev. Henry Rohlman, D.D., as Coadjutor to the See of Dubuque with the right of succession and with the Titular See of Macre in Rhodope.

One of the Apostolic Constitutions, dated Dec. 18, 1943,[1] provides for the establishment of a new diocese in the Republic of El Salvador, namely that of San Vincenzo, carved from the Archdiocese of San Salvador. The other Apostolic Constitution, dated Jan. 12, 1944,[2] elevates the Prefecture of Shuntehfu in China to the status of a Vicariate. The Apostolic Letter, dated June 20, 1943,[3] confers the status of a minor basilica on a church of the Third Order Regulars erected in honor of St. Francis of Assisi at Palma in the Diocese of Majorca. The Allocution, delivered on June 24, 1944,[4] in the presence of His Eminence, Peter Cardinal Fumasoni Biondi, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and of the President, Moderators and Officials of the Pontifical Missionary Institute, expresses our Holy Father's gratification at being able to address them as representing the universal Church at a time when direct contact with the various nations is so difficult, as he sees in them

[1] P. 201. (All footnotes refer to pages in Vol. XXXVI [1944] of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. Consequently only the proper page will be indicated.)

[2] P. 204.

[3] P. 205.

[4] P. 207.

a manifestation of the Church's consciousness of her mission of teaching all nations, and a symbol of a crusade fought with the sword of the spirit, the fruits of which future history will show to excel those of the Crusades of the Middle Ages.

The decree of the Holy Office, dated July 21, 1944,[5] is a response to a doubt more than once presented to the Holy Office, as is stated in the decree, concerning the teaching of mitigated Millenarism, which holds that, before the final judgment, our Lord is to appear on earth to reign, either accompanied or not accompanied by many of the elect. The response declares that this doctrine cannot safely be taught.

The decree of the Sacred Congregation of Religious, dated Jan. 24, 1944,[6] provided for a special Commission to be established within that Sacred Congregation under the presidency of the Secretary, charged with the supervision of the the training of religious, and especially of the education of clerical religious.

The decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites concerning processes of canonization declare: (1) under date of Feb. 27, 1944,[7] that in view of the two miracles wrought through her intercession after her beatification it is safe to proceed to the canonization of Blessed Frances Xavier Cabrini, Foundress of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; (2) under the same date,[8] that two miracles have been proved as having been wrought through the intercession of Blessed Michael Garicoits, Confessor, Founder of the Society of Priests of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus; (3) under date of April 30, 1944,[9] that two miracles have been proved as having been wrought through the intercession of Blessed Nicholas De Flue, Swiss hermit. A fourth decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated June 23, 1944,[10] is rather a declaration to the effect that when Cardinals impart the Apostolic Blessing at the end of Pontifical Mass with the plenary indulgence attached they are to use the rite and formula prescribed in the Pontificale Romanum for use by the hierarchy. The declaration indicates that it applies only when the blessing is given outside the City of Rome,

[5] P. 212.
[6] P. 213.
[7] P. 215.
[8] P. 217.
[9] P. 219.
[10] P. 221.

since within the City no one is privileged to impart the Apostolic Blessing because of the presence of our Holy Father.

The decree of the Sacred Penitentiary, dated July 10, 1944,[11] attaches indulgences to the ejaculation, "Thy Will be done": five hundred days each time; a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions to those who have daily recited it for a month.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS IN THE *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* IN 1943–1944

Certain appointments made by the Holy See were reported in the early issues of the *Review* during 1944 as having appeared in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. Exclusive of these already reported, the following appointments have been noted.

Protonotaries Apostolic:

June 18, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgr. William M. Farrell, of the Diocese of Wichita.

Sept. 3, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Camillus Thiebaut, of the Diocese of St. Cloud; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas U. Reilly, of the Diocese of Trenton; and Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Francis Maria Racine and Peter Mathias Humbert Wynhoven, of the Archdiocese of New Orleans.

Jan. 29, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Augustine Vigliero, of the Diocese of Lafayette.

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

March 12, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph A. McCaffrey, James J. Brown, F. M. Fagan, T. W. Tierney, Joseph F. Flannelly, Charles J. Finnegan, and Edward V. Dargin, of the Archdiocese of New York.

March 13, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Henry O'Carroll, Joseph A. Farrell, and Gaetano Arcese, of the Archdiocese of New York.

May 25, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Richard James Daly, Joseph Bernard Glynn, James McErlean, Samuel V. Fraser, August Paul Koerperich, and Thomas Keogan, of the Diocese of Concordia.

May 31, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward L. McDonald, of the Diocese of Paterson, and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lambert Hoch, of the Diocese of Sioux Falls.

June 4, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Ferdinand George Mock, Charles August Becker, C. F. Broerman, H. S. Haukap, Michael C. Grogan, and Francis Augustine O'Brien, of the Diocese of Lincoln.

[11] P. 222.

June 7, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Mark Kenny Carroll, Leo John Steck, John Joseph Butler, Thomas D. Kennedy, John Thomas Sesnon, and Thomas Joseph Lloyd, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

June 17, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis Cleary, of the Diocese of Brooklyn; and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph Simon Ryder, of the Diocese of Fort Wayne.

June 19, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. William J. Lee, Martin J. Egan, Daniel P. Murphy, and Edmund J. Yahn, of the Diocese of Wheeling.

Aug. 20, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Louis H. Boudreaux and Louis Massebiau, of the Diocese of Lafayette.

Sept. 2, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Maurice John Burgeois, of the Diocese of Lafayette; and Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John V. Plauche and Francis J. Plutz, of the Diocese of Alexandria.

Sept. 3, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Albert Robert Koenig, Lucian Joseph Caillouet, and Raphael Christopher Labit, of the Archdiocese of New Orleans.

Sept. 4, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Leo Zryd, Jeremiah Moriarty, Mathias Jodocy, Joseph Dittman, and John Thaddeus Holland, of the Diocese of Marquette.

Sept. 6, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Louis O'Day, Joseph F. Cieminski, Julius W. Haun, Bernard A. Kramer, Daniel Coleman, William E. F. Griffin, and A. M. Gmeinder, of the Diocese of Winona.

Sept. 10, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Augustine Schmidt and Charles John Tighe, of the Diocese of Harrisburg.

Sept. 22, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Leo Joseph Ryan, Frederick Peter Lackey, James A. Brennan, and William Augustine Gill, of the Diocese of Richmond.

Oct. 1, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Francis J. Wagner, Stephen H. Cauley, August Hoeing, John William Murphy, and Francis Anthony Robaczewski, of the Diocese of Erie.

Dec. 29, 1943: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Jerome Ambrose Rapp, Joseph A. Valenta, and Stephen Chataignon, of the Diocese of Galveston.

Jan. 28, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Mason Connor and James Arthur Garvey, of the Diocese of Oklahoma-Tulsa.

Feb. 15, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. James F. Enright, George T. Rockett, and John G. Bishop, of the Diocese of St. Augustine.

Feb. 17, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgr. L. Curtis Tiernan, of the Diocese of Kansas City.

March 13, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. George A. Mayer, Matthew F. McEvoy, and Roman R. Atkielski, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

March 15, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Leverer, Farrell P. Reilly, Edward Joseph Kersting, William M. Mahoney, George B. Radant, John J. Shanahan, Rudolph Kielpiaski, Joseph Kuitter, Bernard M.

Kobelinski, and William H. Eggers, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee; and Aloysius J. Miller, of the Diocese of Pueblo.

May 6, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. William Klinkhammer and Moses Dufault, of the Diocese of Crookston; and Louis D. Berube, of the Diocese of Ogdensburg.

May 8, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Baptist Scheper, of the Diocese of Little Rock; Peter Engel, of the Diocese of Belleville; John J. Sheerin, of the Diocese of Paterson; Edward J. Quinn, William J. Anthony, Joseph A. Tieken, John H. Schwartz, Eugene A. Davis, and Bernard J. Beckmeyer, of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati; and Frederick O. Beck, Thomas A. Flynn, Joseph Jacobi, and James T. Lockwood, of the Archdiocese of San Antonio.

May 9, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Walter Carroll, of the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary to His Holiness:

Feb. 26, 1943: Very Rev. Msgrs. Robert McCormick, John Scally, George G. Murdock, Walter P. Kellenberg, John J. Hartigan, John J. McCafferty, and Valentine F. Snyder, of the Archdiocese of New York.

March 21, 1943: Very Rev. Msgrs. Edward V. McCullough of the Diocese of Dallas; and August Fussenegger, Thomas Kilfoil, and Leonard Wernsing, of the Archdiocese of Indianapolis.

April 15, 1943: Very Rev. Msgrs. Thomas Francis O'Carroll and Timothy Manning, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Dec. 16, 1943: Very Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Kunc and John Vanicek, of the Diocese of Galveston.

March 2, 1944: Very Rev. Msgrs. Edward Rodenkirch and William Groessel, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

April 20, 1944: Very Rev. Msgrs. Joseph Hewetson, Walter Henry Hill, and William F. Louis, of the Diocese of Paterson; Joseph C. Feldkamp, Edwin A. Hemmen, Joseph M. Hoflinger, and Joseph A. Murray, of the Diocese of Little Rock; F. A. Biendl, F. Gressle, James F. McNary, and Charles E. Spence, of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati; James T. Lyng, of the Diocese of Ogdensburg; and Anthony F. Drozd and John L. Morkovsky, of the Archdiocese of San Antonio.

May 11, 1944: Very Rev. Msgr. John Joseph Shanley, of the Diocese of Paterson.

Knight of the Order of Pius:

July 15, 1943: Dr. Walter Martin Holleran, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great:

Feb. 16, 1944: Thomas E. Braniff and John F. Martin, of the Diocese of Oklahoma-Tulsa.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great:

June 1, 1943: Michael Mohr, William D. Jochems, W. Dower, Martin Hagan, John Baptist Towner, of the Diocese of Wichita.

June 4, 1943: Eugene Mudd, Oliver Parks, and Edward Schneiderhanhn, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

July 15, 1943: Henry George Johansing, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Aug. 21, 1943: Julian Augustine Aubertin, Thomas Mark Callahan, Joseph Cleveland Fruge, Charles Hamilton, Francis E. Landry, Francis Xavier Mouton, Daniel William Woorhies, of the Diocese of Lafayette.

Sept. 2, 1943: John Walsh of the Diocese of Marquette.

Sept. 22, 1943: Allison Owen, James John Henry Kessels, Joseph R. Bandier, William Joseph Guste, of the Archdiocese of New Orleans.

Feb. 16, 1944: John F. Eberle and John Emmett Layden, of the Diocese of Oklahoma-Tulsa.

May 6, 1944: Peter Kraemer, of the Diocese of La Crosse, and Joseph John Keller, of the Diocese of Little Rock.

Commander of the Order of St. Sylvester the Pope:

Sept. 1, 1943: Charles A. Walsh, of the Diocese of Concordia.

Privy Chamberlains of the Sword and Cape:

May 20, 1943: Joseph Desloge, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

June 2, 1943: Charles A. Breitung, of the Diocese of Oklahoma-Tulsa.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

PRAYER BEFORE STUDY

Thou whom Doctors crucified,
Keep us from their sin of pride.
Help us see, with children's eyes,
Beauty hidden from the wise.
Thou who art the Truth, the Way—
Adjuva nos, Domine!

E. D. B.

Book Reviews

CATHOLIC ART AND CULTURE. By Edward Ingram Watkin. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1944. Pp. 226, 40 pages of illustrations outside the text, frontispiece. $4.50.

This latest book by the well-known Catholic author, E. I. Watkin, is an essay on a vast and interesting subject, Christian art and culture. It is not a complete and comprehensive treatise but a synthetic study of Catholic culture in all its vicissitudes during the various periods of Christian history. The reader should have a sufficient knowledge of Christian arts and letters in order to understand and appreciate fully the remarks, often very brief and casual, about persons and events.

The author divides his subject into five cultural epochs: the classical autumn, the Christian spring; summer: Medieval Christendom; late summer: the Renaissance; autumn: the age of Baroque; winter: the modern world. The cultural product of those Christian centuries is brought into relation with the religious fervor and the Catholic spirit of each period. Mr. Watkin shows how the rise and fall of Christian arts and letters are conditioned by the rise and fall of the inward spirit, the mystical element of religion: "Every organic, that is every living, culture must be inspired by religion which exercises in it a function analogous to that of the soul in the living body" (p. 22). He applies to arts and letters the double movement of the soul, the imminent and the transcendant, the horizontal and the vertical. Gothic art was the expression of the transcendent, vertical movement of the soul. The Gothic cathedral, the *Summa,* and Dante's *Divine Comedy* are immortal monuments of the vertical movement of the Middle Ages. The straight lines of the Greco-Roman classical period were a manifestation of the immanent, horizontal movement. The dome and the round arch mediating between the horizontal and the vertical created, according to Mr. Watkin, what was later called the Baroque. The author evidences great liking for Baroque art and culture, regarding them as a renaissance of the Gothic. He qualifies the modern age as the winter of Catholic arts and letters. In Europe, at least, Catholic culture is dead and buried: "The old Catholic religion-culture of Europe is dead and is being carried out to burial" (p. 200). This is one of several exaggerations met in the book. The soul of Catholic culture is Catholic religion. Since Catholic religion never dies, Catholic culture cannot be considered as dead even when, as at present, the religious spirit is

very low. As long as the soul is still in the body, the person should not be declared dead but sleeping.

Mr. Watkin is convinced that a great renewal and revival of both the Catholic spirit and Catholic culture will follow upon the present winter. He speaks of "rebirth of Christ's mystical body" and he thinks that devotion to St. Joseph, the "patron of contemplative prayer," will contribute to this rebirth, and that St. Joseph will assist at the rebirth "as he assisted at the birth of His physical body" (p. 203). The Church founded by Christ is Christ's Mystical Body. It has in itself the plenitude of life and all the unfailing means of grace. The Church never was and never is in need of rebirth. The author also says that in the coming period of rebirth "Doctrines will no longer be accepted solely on authority. . . . Contemplation will be spread widely throughout the Church and with it mystical experience" (p. 202). He tries to confirm his prophecy by the authority of that visionary prophet, Abbot Joachim of Flora (1132-1202), who predicted the advent of a wholly mystic and contemplative Church. But true mysticism never supersedes the necessity of faith, regardless of all mystical experience; and if "doctrines will no longer be accepted solely on authority" what becomes of faith? The real message of the book is, unfortunately, not so much one of aesthetics as of religion. It is the message of a quasi-emancipation from authority in the new era of the Spirit. This message, we are sorry to say, is distinctly not a Catholic message.

The author curiously introduces the gentle St. Gregory the Great as calling the laity of the dark ages, indeed even the clergy, brute beasts, *bruta animalia* (p. 39). "The vast mass of the laity were more than ever the brute beasts St. Gregory had termed them" (p. 62). He is evidently alluding to the words of St. Gregory in *Homilia 17 in Lucam X,* which reads: *Quasi ergo inter bruta animalia petra salis, debet esse sacerdos in populis.* These words, if correctly understood (or even correctly translated), do not warrant Mr. Watkin's assertion.

We are reminded once again, as often in recent months when we read of lay persons assuming the role of theologians, of that golden rule set by Horace in his *De arte poetica: Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, aequam.*

PASCAL P. PARENTE

THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY. A Historical Study. By Trevor Gervase Jalland. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1944. Pp. xi + 568. $7.50.

This is one of the most significant and important non-Catholic religious books to have appeared for a long time. The contents, given as

the Bampton Lectures for 1942, are intended as "a survey of the relations of the Papacy and the Christian Church, paying particular attention to their character within the first six centuries" (p. vii). In dealing with the ecclesiastical history of the first six centuries, Dr. Jalland shows an extraordinary competence. He is accurate and informative in his treatment of the Petrine texts in the New Testament, and in his exposition of the passages from Sts. Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus, and Cyprian pertinent to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. He is particularly at home when explaining the events and the documents connected with the time of St. Leo the Great.

Unfortunately Dr. Jalland's historical competence seems to be limited to the period of the primitive Church. As a result, his chapters dealing with the period since the Council of Trent show little resemblance to the earlier portions of the book. In dealing with patristic times, Dr. Jalland gives ample evidence that he has mastered the critical apparatus requisite for the proper treatment of this field. In writing of the post-Reformation Papacy, however, he does not even use Pastor. His lack of acquaintance with, or indifference towards, the important sources for an understanding of the Papacy in modern times and the recent theology on the Papacy, manifests itself in the poor quality of the final chapters.

The Church and the Papacy was not intended as a merely historical study. Dr. Jalland meant to examine the Papacy with a view towards marking its position in "the glorious reunited Christendom of the future." He believes that "the perfect integration of the idea of the Papacy with the doctrine of the Church, more particularly with episcopacy, has yet to be accomplished, and can be effected only in the light of a fuller knowledge of God's purpose than we can claim to possess at the present time" (p. 543). In other words, the distinguished Bampton Lecturer is convinced that God's revealed message about His Church is not clear enough now to enable one to know exactly how that Church is organized.

No small part of Dr. Jalland's confusion seems to arise from the Catholic books which he used as authorities. There is absolutely no indication that he has read or heard of the great scholars who have dealt with the theological explanation of the Vatican Council's decrees. Much of his imprecision is due to the fact that he consulted, not authorities like Dieckmann, D'Herbigny or Billot, but a less capable lot. From an unfortunate sentence in one Catholic book, Dr. Jalland reasons that "The obvious inference seems to be that it is impossible to give any absolutely clear-cut answer to the question, 'Who are members of the Church?'" (p. 538). Another, and a still wilder writer, leads him to the conclusion "that not even Roman Catholicism itself has succeeded

in establishing an absolute delimitation of the Church, any more than an absolute distinction between membership and non-membership" (p. 539). A third Catholic writer supplies him with the information that the modern Catholic attitude seems "to give point to Salmon's gibe—or was it Whatley's?—that the Pope is infallible so long as he defines nothing" (p. 534).

The significance of *The Church and the Papacy* lies in recognition of some sort of primacy in St. Peter and in the Vicar of Christ on earth who is his successor. Dr. Jalland is willing to admit that St. Peter was *princeps* in the sense of being the chief mouthpiece and spokesman of the Church. At the same time he denies that he was absolute Sovereign, "or that he possessed or was believed to possess an unlimited authority" over the members of the Church as individuals (p. 542). Manifestly the book would have been improved, and the distinguished author would be enlightened, by an investigation of the Catholic theology of the primacy.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

ORIGEN, HIS LIFE AT ALEXANDRIA. By René Cadiou. Translated by John A. Southwell. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Company, 1944. Pp. xiv + 338. $3.25.

There was a certain tendency clearly visible in most of the studies of the last twenty years concerning Origen. The theological aspects of his writings were neglected and his philosophical ideas overemphasized in order to make him appear entirely dependent on Plato and Aristotle as well as on Neo-Pythagorean and Stoic authors. The result was a dechristianized and pagan Origen as, for instance, in E. de Faye's *Origène, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Paris, 1923-1928), and Hal Koch's *Pronoia und Paideusis, Studien über Origenes und sein Verhältnis zum Platonismus* (Berlin, 1932), and in many other special studies which show a definite rationalizing tendency.

René Cadiou's book is, therefore, most welcome because it does justice to the Greek thought and Greek culture which formed a great part of Origen's philosophical equipment. It does not neglect the Neoplatonic and Valentinian influence in his world of ideas. But it does not stop there. It makes a successful attempt to interpret his theology by giving a literary analysis of each of his great works, like his commentaries on the Old and New Testament writings, his treatise on the resurrection and his four books of "bases." Thus it pictures Origen as the great theologian and former of Eastern Christian spirituality, whose influence on Christian thought is comparable only with that of St. Augustine or of St. Thomas Aquinas. At the same time it gives an account of the history of the School of Alexandria during the first three decades of

the third century, the period when Origen was teaching there and was formulating its doctrine.

There are a number of new results obtained by the author. Two points I wish to mention here. First, Cadiou traces the influence of Hippolytus of Rome on Origen's *Commentary on the Psalms.* Its theology of the Logos, for example, indicates that in this book Origen was following in the footsteps of the Roman. Hippolytus, seeing even in the life of Jesus the immutable relations of the Trinity, had employed the Gospel narrative as a mirror in which to study the reflected plan of that mystery. Origen follows the same line, regarding the Son as the sharer of the Father's purposes and as His right hand in the work of creation, and also as already possessing, in virtue of His divine nature, the world He is to conquer by His human nature. Secondly, Cadiou undertakes the task of making a plea for the sympathetic understanding of the allegorical method employed by Origen. He does not confine himself, as most of the biographers of Origen do, to stating that Origen's interpretation of Scripture is allegorical and influenced by Gnostic mentality originating from pagan sources. He investigates the purpose of this allegorism. The symbolism which Origen employed was a literary method capable of serving the purposes of Christian meditation and prayer. Abundant evidence of this is found in his homilies, delivered by him to congregations of the faithful in church. Those popular sermons were as rich in allegory as his learned commentaries. Origen's deeply religious soul was always eager to derive spiritual food from an explanation of the Scriptures. His interpretation of the Bible belongs to the history of Christian mysticism rather than to biblical science. "To condemn this method of biblical study is to reject an important element of Christian spirituality." We shall not be able to do justice to Origen without having a monograph on Origen as a mystic. Fortunately, the beginnings of such a study have been made. In 1931, W. Völker published his fine study on Origen's ideal of perfection, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes.* I regret that Cadiou could not take advantage of A. Lieske's *Die Theologie der Logosmystik bei Origenes* (Münster, 1938). Going through Origen's spiritual thoughts frequently reminds one of the language and ideas of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Eckart and Tauler. He is one of the first great mystics of the Christian church. Unfortunately, this side of Origen's teaching and writings has been so far very much neglected.

A few doubts remain. I am not convinced that the chronological order of Origen's writings which Cadiou establishes will find the approval of the historians of ancient Christian literature. Further investigations will be needed to arrange his works according to their dates. Furthermore, I do not think that the author is right in calling Origen the

founder of the School of Alexandria. He reformed this school and secured its public recognition. But Clement of Alexandria deserves the merit of being the founder.

On p. iii the reader finds a publisher's note: *"Origen, His Life at Alexandria,* is a translation of *La jeunesse d'Origène* by René Cadiou, published by Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris." In order not to disappoint the reader it must be stated that the present volume cannot take the place of the original French edition published in 1935. The present English "translation" eliminates not less than 637 most valuable footnotes packed with literature, information, and quotations from sources. What is worse, the English "translation" does not refer to the critical editions of Origen's writings as the French original does, but substitutes Migne's. This is inexcusable from the philological point of view. The translation itself has been found to be not only free but incorrect in many places. The division in chapters is not the one of the French original. Subdivisions have been made into independent chapters. Thus the logical arrangement of the French author has been lost. As a result, the English "translation" cannot be consulted for any scientific use.

JOHANNES QUASTEN

THE CALLING OF A DIOCESAN PRIEST. By Joseph Clifford Fenton, S.T.D. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Book Shop, 1944. Pp. 68. Fifty cents.

The Catholic layman knows, of course, that his Church glories in a twofold clergy, diocesan and regular. Yet it may well be that he is not in a position to draw an exact distinction between the functions of the two. If he goes to his pastor for reading matter, the priest can give him books from his own library on the meaning of the priesthood, and supply others on the nature of religious vocation. But the chances are that he will be hard put to find a work of small compass which makes clear the precise difference between the two clerical callings.

Dr. Fenton's booklet now provides an admirable solution to the difficulty. Short enough to be read through at one sitting, it is substantial enough to make a man aware that its author knows whereof he writes. It commences by setting out the distinction between the two vocations; the diocesan is given over to a continuance of Christ's priestly mission down through the ages, the other finds its purpose in the achievement of personal sanctification. For the religious in priest's orders, sacerdotal labor is a means towards his own perfection; for the secular cleric it is an end in itself. With that clarification, Dr. Fenton devotes the rest of his study to the diocesan vocation, as the title indicates. A dozen pages discuss the motives a boy must have if he intends

to present himself for the priesthood under the direct supervision of his bishop. Then follow a number of good remarks upon the purpose and pattern of seminary training along with some apt observations as to the place of prayer in the life of the diocesan clergy. The whole is brought to a close with a short chapter on the spirit one expects in the secular priesthood.

It is pleasing to note in this brochure that its author has succeeded in portraying the attractiveness of the diocesan vocation while manifesting genuine appreciation of the beauty inherent in the religious ideal. There is nothing that smacks of party spirit in these pages. Diocesan clergy will look with favor upon this description of their task; their brethren in religion will be equally gratified with the understanding shown their way of life.

Yet perhaps the great merit of the booklet lies in the clear picture it paints for seminarians of the nature of their calling. To them it presents in concise fashion a rationale for all the studies and regulations that make up their daily routine. Many an ordained priest in his diocese would give much to have had available such a pattern during his own seminary courses.

Criticism may be limited, I think, to one point. It is more a question of airing an opinion than of real disagreement with the author.

Dr. Fenton is himself a scholastic theologian. He is rightfully convinced that theology must be the center of the seminary curriculum. He acknowledges, of course, that theology is a broad science; that along with the speculative there is a positive side to it which demands much attention. Factually, he says some very sound things about the efforts a young cleric must expend in order to get a good foundation in the various positive disciplines. But these pursuits—biblical science, church history, liturgy, and the others—are apparently not proposed as the major interest of the aspirant to the secular priesthood. "No one man may possibly hope to specialize in all these branches of science," Dr. Fenton says. A few lines later he adds: "However, every seminarian is called upon to act as a specialist in that portion of sacred theology which is called *scholastic* as distinguished from the *positive* section of this science" (p. 39).

Now I do not know whether by that Dr. Fenton truly means that every seminarian, without exception, must make scholastic theology his specialty, that all must center thereon their major interest. Some may read that into his words. And it is a view, frankly, that I question. For me it leaves untouched a very real problem. What are we to do, for example, with the young man whose interests lie clearly in the field of positive theology? That he must have a thoroughly good training in the scholastic part of the science is beyond dispute. But may we de-

mand more than that? Are we to say to him that because he cannot master all of Scripture and all of church history and all the rest that therefore he must concentrate upon scholasticism? May he not legitimately choose one of the positive theological studies and focus his attention upon that, provided always that he get a solid general formation in the other prescribed fields?

One has to be a realist in such matters. What a man *gets* in his seminary course is decidedly important; what he *gets to like* has deeper permanent meaning. I should hazard the guess that it is better to let a boy with positive theological tastes develop that bent during his student days rather than shunt him off into another side of the same science which may have no special attraction for him. Whetted appetites should mean continued reading in the same field after ordination; stifled inclinations and those forced into foreign channels may achieve something for the moment. But they hide the danger that scholarly interests will be put aside with the student's soutane.

But this, as I say, is opinion. I liked Dr. Fenton's booklet. And I feel that those who turn to it will like it also.

HENRY G. J. BECK

THE PRIEST AS A TEACHER

In every age it is and shall be the duty of God's priests to proclaim the salutary truths which our Heavenly Father has given to the world through His Divine Son; to present them to each generation in the way that will move their minds and hearts to embrace and love them; to defend them, when necessary, against every attack of error. From this it is obvious that the priest should have a wide acquaintance with every department of learning that has a bearing on religious truth. Hence in our age, when so many misleading theories are put forth on every side, when every department of natural truth and fact is actively explored for objections against revealed religion, it is evident how extensive and thorough should be the knowledge of the minister of the Divine Word, that he may be able to show forth worthily the beauty, the superiority, the necessity of the Christian religion, and to prove that there is nothing in all that God has made to contradict anything that God has taught.

—From the Pastoral Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States assembled in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. (*Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii* [Baltimore: John Murphy, 1886], pp. lxxviii f.).

Book Notes

One need not be an alarmist to view with apprehension the large number of questionable books which so very often top the best-seller list, especially in fiction. It is not exactly a matter of the moment—for if it is not "Forever Amber" it is "The Valley of Decision" or "The Grapes of Wrath"—but perhaps more a matter of the times in which we live. Or perhaps it is one of those evils which will always be with us. It is difficult to distinguish between liberty and license.

But the intention here is not to launch any opinions on the quality of the books which are selling in huge numbers today, but rather to call attention to some of the things which Catholics are doing about it. For much effective work is being done, both by individuals and by groups. One of the most active agencies at present is the Catholic bookshop. It is really amazing to find how many of these have sprung up in all parts of the country in the past decade, and to see the many types of work in which they are engaging.

Most people welcome guidance in selecting books. Book reviews are only fair guides in most cases and even the experts are stumped about the purposes which publishers are trying to gain through their glamorous blurbs on dust jackets and in advertising columns. It would make an interesting study to try to discover why the publishers believe that the American people are now more gullible than they were back in the goldbrick days.

Most of the new Catholic book shops offer excellent service in selection. For the typical Catholic book shop is no longer the little cosy corner of the general store where one can obtain prayer-books, Lenten readings and Goffine's *Devout Instructions*. It is rather an attractive spot in the busiest part of the city, just around the corner from the crowds, well-appointed, well-stocked with excellent books and presided over by an intelligent, cultured, and well-informed person who understands books and readers. There one will probably find a customer or two who have dropped in for a weekly chat on books and for a once-over of the new arrivals. There, too, are to be found the latest journals of the book and library trade, the latest publishers' trade circulars, and the periodicals which carry book reviews. Perhaps one or two nights a week the shop will be open as the meeting place of a group of book-lovers or a study-club. Not infrequently an author or an illustrator will drop in to pick up some of the comments on his latest opus.

The new owner of the bookshop does not confine his—more frequently her—efforts to those who happen to drop in, but will be active in contacting study-clubs, social and fraternal organizations, schools and parish societies trying to interest them in books. He will be ready to address a meeting or to send another speaker, on a moment's notice. Some of the more successful publish lists and comments on books, ranging from the mimeographed sheet to the elaborate *Books on Trial* of the Thomas More Book Shop of Chicago; the rating sheet of the latter is now used by several diocesan weeklies in syndicated form. Some, such as the Catholic Lending Library of Hartford, the library in the Dominican parish, Holy Rosary congregation, Minneapolis, the Catholic Rental Library of Wichita, and St. Peter's of Chicago are nationally known, while others confine their activities to their own localities.

Any serious discussion of the ways and means of meeting the problems created by questionable literature naturally includes preventive measures. One of the most successful of these, according to those who have made notable studies of reading habits, is to create a taste for works that are worth-while. The same